DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 014 CE 000 288

AUTHOR	Kelly, Earl McNeil
TITLE	A Study of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs as Reflected by the County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties in Florida.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	339p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	*County Officials; *County Programs; Doctoral Theses; *Extension Agents; Government Employees; Individual Characteristics; Program Administration; Program Content; Program Coordination; *Rural Urban Differences; State Programs; State Surveys; Statistical Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

County commissioners from Florida's fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties were compared in terms of their personal and social characteristics and the relative importance they attribute to selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs. Association between these two comparisons was then assessed to determine whether or not modifications of programs were in order, to determine the need for better communication, and to determine whether or not extension work can be effectively administered uniformly in rural and urban counties. Conclusions were that commissioners find extension programs worthy of continued support, the State and Federal priorities are generally compatible with County priorities, and that although there were significant personal and social differences between the two commissioner groups, there was not a polarization along rural-urban lines in terms of program content and clientele. Data gathered are presented and analyzed in 182 tables. (MS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082014

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

A STUDY OF THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED CONTENT AND CLIENTELE OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE PROGRAMS AS REFLECTED BY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FROM RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES IN FLORIDA

By
EARL McNEIL KELLY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Department of Adult
Education in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Irwin R. Jahns
Professor Directing Dissertation

George F. Aker

Daniel A. Wren

Wayne L. Schroeder

Phillip R. Fordyce
Dean, College of Education

June, 1973

CE 000 288

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance given by Dr. Irwin R. Jahns, the major professor. His instruction and counsel during the period of doctoral study were most constructive and invaluable. His patience with and encouragement of the author, especially during the research phase of doctoral work, are deeply appreciated.

Sincere appreciation is also expressed to Dr. George F. Aker, Dr. Daniel A. Wren, and Dr. Wayne L. Schroeder for meaningful and effective instruction in the classroom and for their suggestions, guidance, encouragement, and support during graduate study.

Dr. M. O. Watkins, former Dean for Cooperative Extension at the University of Florida, and Dr. J. N. Busby, present Dean for Cooperative Extension, made it possible for the author to secure leave from employment to pursue doctoral study. Their interest, encouragement, and support have been most valuable. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. J. T. McCown, Associate Dean for Extension, for his assistance and encouragement in developing and conducting this study.

The author wishes to express appreciation to Mr. F. S. Perry, Dr. W. H. Smith, and Dr. E. R. Wheaton, District Extension Agents, for their cooperation in conducting this study throughout the State of Florida. The assistance given by the County Extension Directors in the counties involved in this study is also gratefully acknowledged.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. A. A. Straughn, Dr. Pauline Calloway, Dr. Emily King, Dr. Shaw Grigsby, and Miss Evelyn Standish for their assistance in developing the survey instrument and analyzing the data.

Special gratitude is expressed to the author's wife, Annie Ruth; his daughter, Ann; and his sons, Neil and Bobby, for their understanding, cooperation, and encouragement during graduate study.

Finally, to the author's mother, Mrs. D. A. Kelly, sincere appreciation is expressed for encouragement and support throughout the author's formal education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study
Background Information and Statement of Problem
Significance of the Study
Definition of Terms

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 15

Introduction
Definition of Perception
Factors Influencing Perception
Findings of Related Perception Studies
Summary
Hypotheses of the Study

III. METHODOLOGY 53

Population
Preparation of the Instrument
Pretesting the Instrument
Collection of Data
Analysis of Data

IV. DATA ANALYSIS 57

Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners
Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Extension Programs as Perceived by County Commissioners
Association of Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners with Their Perception of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs

Chapter Page

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 154

Objectives of the Study
Methodology
Findings
Conclusions
Implications

Appendices

A. QUESTIONNAIRE 171

B. PERCEPTIONS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONCERNING SELECTED CONTENT AND CLIENTELE OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS 181

C. CHI-SQUARE TABLES OF INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES 200

BIBLIOGRAPHY 308

VITA 315

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Rank Order Comparisons of Relative Importance of Nine Extension Program Areas as Perceived by Clientele Groups 34
2. Rank Order of Relative Importance of Selected Extension Home Economics Program Areas as Perceived by Georgia County Commission Chairmen and Extension Jury 39
3. Rank Order Comparison of Relative Importance of Selected Extension Program Areas as Perceived by Utah County Commissioners and Extension Agents 40
4. Rank Order Comparisons of Relative Amount of Time Extension Should Spend with Selected Clientele Groups. 41
5. Rank Order Distribution of Amount of Time and Effort Extension Should Spend with Selected Clientele Groups as Perceived by Alabama Legislators 47
6. Rank Order Comparisons of Relative Importance of Extension Home Economics Clientele Groups as Perceived by Georgia County Commission Chairmen and Extension Jury 48
7. Classification of County Commissioners by Tenure 58
8. Classification of County Commissioners by Main Occupation 59
9. Classification of County Commissioners by Level of Formal Education 60
10. Classification of County Commissioners by Age 61
11. Classification of County Commissioners by Residential Background 62
12. Classification of County Commissioners by Extent of Direct Involvement in Extension Programs and/or Activities 63

Table Page

13. Classification of County Commissioners by Perceived Economic Value of Agriculture to the County 64

14. Classification of County Commissioners by Familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service 65

15. Total Score and Rank Order of Agricultural Subjects as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 68

16. Total Score and Rank Order of Home Economics Subjects as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 70

17. Total Score and Rank Order of 4-H (Youth Work) Subjects as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 71

18. Total Score and Rank Order of Agricultural Clientele Groups as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 73

19. Total Score and Rank Order of Home Economics Clientele Groups as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 75

20. Total Score and Rank Order of 4-H (Youth Work) Clientele Groups as Perceived by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 76

21. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties 80

22. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties 85

23. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties 88

24. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties 90

Table	Page
25. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties	95
26. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties	97
27. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties	101
28. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties	108
29. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Content as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties	113
30. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties	117
31. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties	121
32. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties	123
33. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties	126
34. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties	131

Table | Page

35. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties 134

36. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Agricultural Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 139

37. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable Home Economics Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 145

38. Summary of Association of Independent Variables with the Ten Elements of the Dependent Variable 4-H (Youth Work) Program Clientele as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties 149

39. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Subjects 182

40. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Subjects 183

41. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Subjects 184

42. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Subjects 185

43. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Subjects 186

44. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Subjects 187

45. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Groups 188

46. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Groups 189

47. Rural County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Groups 190

48. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Groups 191

Table Page

49. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Groups 192

50. Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Groups 193

51. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Subjects 194

52. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Subjects 195

53. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Subjects 196

54. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Agricultural Groups 197

55. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of Home Economics Groups 198

56. Rural and Urban County Commissioners' Perceptions of 4-H (Youth Work) Groups 199

57. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products". . 201

58. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" . . 201

59. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Management of Timberlands" 202

60. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" . 202

61. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Management of Timberlands" 203

62. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Land Use Planning" 203

Table Page

63. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Lawns, Plants, and Trees in the Yard" . 204

64. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Management of Timberlands" 204

65. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Lawns, Plants and Trees in the Yard" 205

66. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources 205

67. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" 206

68. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" 206

69. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" . 207

70. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Processing of Agricultural Products" . 208

71. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" . . 209

72. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" 210

Table Page

73. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources" 210

74. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Farm Business Management" 211

75. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Agricultural Labor Relations" 212

76. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Public Affairs Education" 213

77. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" 214

78. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Production of Agricultural Products" 215

79. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Processing of Agricultural Products 216

80. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Processing of Agricultural Products" 217

81. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Processing of Agricultural Products" 218

Table Page

82. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" 219

83. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" 220

84. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Marketing of Agricultural Products" 221

85. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources" 221

86. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Farm Business Management" . . . 222

87. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Farm Business Management" 223

88. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Farm Business Management" 224

89. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Agricultural Labor Relations" 225

90. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Lawns, Plants, and Trees in the Yard" 226

91. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Agricultural Labor Relations" 227

Table Page

92. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources" 228

93. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Subject "Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources" 228

94. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Leadership Development" . 229

95. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Job Preparation" . 229

96. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Cultural Arts" 230

97. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Leadership Development" 231

98. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Job Preparation" 232

99. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Clothing Construction". 233

100. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Renovating Furniture" 234

101. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Renovating Furniture" 235

Table Page

102. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Leadership Development" 236

103. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Consumer Education" . . 237

104. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Consumer Education" 238

105. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Efficient Use of Food Stamps" 239

106. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Efficient Use of Food Stamps" 240

107. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Efficient Use of Food Stamps" 241

108. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Community Development" 242

109. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Understanding and Improving the Environment" 243

110. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Understanding Public Issues" 243

111. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Personal Development" 244

Table Page

112. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Agricultural Skills for Boys" 245

113. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Agricultural Skills for Boys" 246

114. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Community Development" . . . 247

115. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Understanding Public Issues" 248

116. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Health Education" 249

117. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Understanding Public Issues" 250

118. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Personal Development" . . . 251

119. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Food-Nutrition" 252

120. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Part-Time Farmers" 253

121. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Migrant Farm Laborers" 253

Table Page

122. Association Between the Age of Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Homeowners" 254

123. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Local (Domestic) Farm Laborers" 255

124. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Migrant Farm Laborers" 256

125. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Migrant Farm Laborers" . . 257

126. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Large Commercial Farmers" 258

127. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Urban Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agricultural Commodity Organizations" 259

128. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Small Subsistence Farmers" 259

129. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agribusiness Firms" 260

130. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agricultural Commodity Organizations" . . 261

131. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County As Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Homeowners" 262

Table Page

132. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Local (Domestic) Farm Laborers" 263

133. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Migrant Farm Laborers" 264

134. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Large Commercial Farmers" 265

135. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Large Commercial Farmers" 266

136. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Average Size Family Farmers" . . . 267

137. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Average Size Family Farmers" 268

138. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Small Subsistence Farmers" 269

139. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Hobby Farmers" 270

140. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agricultural Commodity Organizations" 271

141. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agricultural Commodity Organizations" 272

Table Page

142. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Homeowners" 273

143. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Homeowners" . . 274

144. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agribusiness Firms" 275

145. Association Between the Age of Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Local (Domestic) Farm Laborers" . . . 276

146. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Local (Domestic) Farm Laborers" 277

147. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Local (Domestic) Farm Laborers" 278

148. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Homemakers from Minority Groups" 279

149. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Farm Homemakers" 280

150. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Small Town and Village Homemakers" 281

151. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Urban and City Homemakers" 282

Table Page

152. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Middle Income Homemakers" 283

153. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Middle Income Homemakers" 284

154. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Senior Citizens" 285

155. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Young Married Women" 286

156. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Young Married Women" 287

157. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Homemakers from Minority Groups" 288

158. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Young Married Women" 289

159. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Urban and City Youth" 290

160. Association Between the Age of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Upper Income Families" 291

161. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Urban Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Farm Youth" 292

Table Page

162. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Urban Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "All Youth Between 9 and 19 Years of Age" 292

163. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Urban Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Rural Non-Farm Youth" . . . 293

164. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Rural Non-Farm Youth" 294

165. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "All Youth Between 7 and 19 Years of Age" 295

166. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Urban Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "All Youth Between 7 and 19 Years of Age" 296

167. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Small Town and Village Youth" . . 296

168. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Low Income Families" 297

169. Association Between the Residential Background of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Middle Income Families" 298

170. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Middle Income Families" 299

Table Page

171. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Middle Income Families" 300

172. Association Between the Level of Education of the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "Youth from Upper Income Families" 301

173. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "All Youth Between 9 and 19 Years of Age" 302

174. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Subject "Clothing Construction" 303

175. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Group "All Youth Between 9 and 19 Years of Age" 303

176. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Urban and City Homemakers" 304

177. Association Between the Tenure of the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Low Income Homemakers" 304

178. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Understanding Economics and the American Business System" 305

179. Association Between the Economic Value of Agriculture to the County as Perceived by the Commissioners from Urban Counties and Their Perception of the 4-H (Youth Work) Subject "Health Education" 305

180. Association Between the Main Occupation of the Commissioners from Rural Counties and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Part-Time Farmers" 306

Table Page

181. Association Between the Familiarity of the Commissioners from Urban Counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and Their Perception of the Agricultural Group "Agricultural Commodity Organizations" 306

182. Association Between the Involvement of Commissioners from Rural Counties in Cooperative Extension Service Programs and/or Activities and Their Perception of the Home Economics Group "Upper Income Homemakers" 307

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the Purpose of the Study, Background Information and Statement of the Problem, Significance of the Study, and Definition of Terms.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to explore and compare the perception of county commissioners from Florida's most rural and most urban counties concerning the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs. More specifically, the objectives of the study were:

1. To identify and compare selected personal and social characteristics of county commissioners from Florida's fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties;
2. To determine the relative importance attributed to selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs by the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties; and,
3. To determine the association between personal and social characteristics of county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties and the relative importance attributed to selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs.

Background Information and Statement of Problem

On July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law the so-called Land-Grant Act which had been offered by U. S. Representative Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont. This legislation, commonly referred to as the Morrill Act, granted to each state 30,000 acres of public land for each U. S. Senator and Representative under apportionment based on the 1860 census. Proceeds from the sale of these lands were to be invested in a perpetual endowment fund which would provide support for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in each of the states. In 1890, Congress, through the second Morrill Act, appropriated up to $25,000 per state for a ten-year period to further finance the Land-Grant colleges. The Nelson Amendment of 1908 provided further funding for these colleges.

The establishment of Florida Agricultural College at Lake City in 1884 under the Morrill Act, marked the beginning of what ultimately became the College of Agriculture of the University of Florida.

The Hatch Act of 1887, to which the Florida Legislature gave assent in 1887, provided for the establishment of an agricultural experiment station at each of the Land-Grant colleges of the several states. Several later acts including the Adams (1906), the Purnell (1925), and the Bankhead-Jones (1935) Acts provided for expanded appropriations to the state experiment stations. By Congressional action in 1955, all of these acts were combined by amending the Hatch Act. Currently, the state agricultural experiment stations' activities under the Hatch Act are administered by the U. S. Secretary of Agriculture, through the State Cooperative Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

The Florida Agricultural Experiment Station was established in 1888 as a part of the Florida Agricultural College at Lake City. In 1905, the passage of the Buckman Act, Chapter 5384, Laws of Florida, formally established the University of Florida as the combined State University and Land-Grant College, which the Board of Control and the State Board of Education voted to locate in Gainesville. The Buckman Act specifically provided for a "department" of agriculture for the University. Both Federal and State law, therefore, prescribes that the Agricultural Experiment Station shall be a unit of the Land-Grant College.

In 1914, the third functional arm of the Land-Grant College concept was provided with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. This Act established the Cooperative Extension Service and specified it would be associated with the various Land-Grant Colleges throughout the Nation. (1971, Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 1100)

Section I of the Act, as amended, states:

> In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State . . . agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

The Smith-Lever Act, therefore, provided a means by which practical information could be taken from the Land-Grant Colleges and the Department of Agriculture to the people in their local environment.

Furthermore, provisions of the Act stipulated that Federal funds must be matched from local sources. Over a period of years, these funds have been supplied by both state and county government, providing a three-way partnership unique in educational annals.

Legislation assenting to the Smith-Lever Act was passed by the Florida Legislature in 1915 (Chapter 241.18, Laws of Florida). This legislation authorized the Board of Control to receive and administer the Federal grant establishing and supporting Cooperative Extension in Florida. A Memorandum of Understanding between the United States Department of Agriculture and the University of Florida has become the legally binding document as prescribed in the basic legislation. The Memorandum is renewed from time to time as deemed necessary to update procedures and reemphasize role and responsibility. The document now in force was executed in January, 1955. Several Acts subsequent to the Smith-Lever Act, including the Capper-Kethcham Act (1928), the Bankhead-Jones Act (1935), the Norris-Doxey Act (1937), Act of 1939, the Department of Agriculture Organic Act (1944), and the Bankhead-Flannagan Act (1945), all expanded the appropriations for and/or the role and scope of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics. In 1955, the amendment to the Smith-Lever Act included the provisions of acts passed subsequent to the basic Smith-Lever Act and provided for appropriations on a continuing basis. In addition, the Agricultural Marketing Act (1946) provided funds for extension work aimed at solving problems within the total food and fiber marketing system (1971, Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 1100).

Although Florida counties have been involved in the financial support of cooperative extension work through the years, it was not until 1972 that the Florida Legislature passed enabling legislation officially providing for county participation in the Cooperative Extension Service. Dowell (1970, pp. 12-13) states that although the original legislation did not specifically define the role of local people, the primary recipients of Extension services, they were, nevertheless, expected to share in the funding of the work. He points out that throughout the half century of the organization, Extension work has maintained a strong identity with the county as the local unit of government. Soule (1952, p. 113) commented, "If the county provides the funds, the local interest and support will be much stronger than if operating funds are regarded as an appropriation out of general revenue." He further suggests that with the county as a unit, the work of the Extension division should be promoted in harmony with the local government and with the support of the county officials who are elected by the people and who will control the appropriation of the county funds needed for the work.

The Cooperative Extension Service has grown through the years as a partnership of local people, the state Land-Grant universities, the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and the county governments. All share in planning and financing Extension programs. The Cooperative Extension Service is, therefore, a unique achievement in American education --an agency for change-- a catalyst for individual and group action. Its formal job is informal education -- to help people help themselves. It transmits practical information on many subjects from research centers and the universities to the public. It presents unbiased facts to help people identify problems and use new technology in solving them -- to help them make their own decisions and organize to act on those decisions (1968, A People and A Spirit, Cond., Cover).

The Cooperative Extension Service has been referred to as "the informal educational arm of both the Department of Agriculture and the respective state Land-Grant colleges and universities" (1958, The

Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement on Scope and Responsibility). It has been described by Knowles (1960, p. 16) as "the largest single adult education organization ever created." Shannon and Schoenfeld (1965, p. 200) describe the Extension Service as "one of the oldest, probably the largest, certainly the most fully developed and perhaps the most effective adult education activity in the United States."

A glowing history of accomplishment and success does not necessarily insure the future of the Cooperative Extension Service. The success and future of any public agency is largely dependent upon the image it creates in the minds of the public and the governing bodies on which it depends for support (1963, Blalock, p. 2). With heavy demands for public funds increasing at a rapid rate, the importance of a favorable image becomes more and more critical. Bell (1960, p. 140) clearly put this point in perspective:

> Tax supported institutions are constantly involved in competition for the tax dollar. Success in this competition depends upon the public image of the institution and its program as well as upon the image held by the members of the legislative bodies.

According to administrative records 33.6 percent of the financial support for Florida Cooperative Extension work was derived from county sources in 1970-71. The image of Extension programs as perceived by county commissioners is, therefore, very important, not only in relation to total financial support, but also because of the effect many of their actions may have on administrative behavior.

Three major factors serve as cause for the Florida Cooperative Extension Service to be concerned about county commissioners' perceptions of Extension Service programs. Population growth, for example, in most of Florida's counties lends support to initiating new public agencies and expanding existing ones to provide services sought by the public. Thus, county commissioners are constantly subjected to pressures from public agencies for additional financial support. These pressures demand that the county commissioners continuously evaluate agency programs for relevance and contributions to society. It is important to the Extension Service, therefore, to determine to what extent the programs being conducted by the Extension Service are perceived by county commissioners as being worthy.

In keeping with a basic principle of adult education, county Extension agents involve the recipients of Extension programs in the planning of programs through advisory committees. Even so, county Extension programs are conducted within the framework of state and national priorities. As county commissioners provide a substantial part of the funds for organizational operations of the Extension Service, and as their participation is entirely voluntary it is considered important by the Extension Service to determine the extent to which they perceive the state and national priorities to be compatible with county priorities.

Social change has brought about change in Cooperative Extension philosophy, hence in Extension programs. Historically, for example, Extension work has been oriented primarily toward farm and rural nonfarm people. Between 1964 and 1969, however, the number of farms in Florida decreased 12.2 percent (1969, Census of Agriculture-Florida, p. 1). Between 1960 and 1970 the rural population of the state decreased 6.6 percent while the urban population increased by this amount (1970, U. S. Census of Population). Even the Florida Legislature changed. A federal court order resulted in the reapportionment of the Florida

Legislature prior to the 1967 legislative session which, in turn, resulted in a change from a previously rural-oriented legislature to that with an urban orientation.

In response to social-change Extension philosophy also changed to more fully embrace the concept of Extension's programs serving the total population. In fact, effective in 1970, the name of the Extension Service was changed from the Florida Agricultural Extension Service to the Florida Cooperative Extension Service.

The changes in Extension philosophy and programs have been met with both favor and disfavor among the general public. Some members of Extension's traditional clientele have expressed very strong resentment about deleting the word "Agricultural" from Extension's name; some persons have expressed resentment concerning the consequences (relating to Extension programs) of urban control of the Florida Legislature; and, Florida Farm Bureau, known as the "Voice of Agriculture," passed a resolution in 1971 calling for the Extension Service to get back to the business of serving farmers. An editorial in The Progressive Farmer (1972, p. 90) analyzes the situation:

> The time has come to take a close, hard look at the Extension Service of our land grant colleges. What should be its future role? Should it continue to extend its activities into urban areas? And if so, how can this be done without crippling its service to agriculture?
>
> As the Extension Service extends its activities into the urban field, farm people are beginning to wonder if it will eventually be taken over by the cities to the decided disadvantage of agriculture.
>
> While Extension's first responsibility is to agriculture, it may be difficult for farm people to establish a claim to all its services. There is no sound reason why a land grant college shouldn't use the Extension method in serving other areas of our society. But agriculture has a right to insist that the Extension Service not spread itself too thin. Any urban program should be funded adequately. And the Service should be organized so that its agricultural

> activities do not eventually come under the domination of city interests and have to compete with them for Extension funds.
>
> The future role of the Extension Service is so important to agriculture that farm organizations and other farm leaders should give the matter first priority. They should study the organization and work with Extension officials in charting a course that will ensure no letup in its service to agriculture.

From the non-agricultural or urban point of view, there has been praise for Extension's efforts in the area of central city youth development programs as well as nutrition programs for the disadvantaged. Programs for senior citizens and in the area of urban horticulture have also been well received. In support of broader Extension programs, Bishop (1969, pp. 151-152 says:

> Far too little emphasis is placed upon the development of the human resource, while special emphasis is placed upon working with farm families - an occupational group. The increasing value of the human resource in our society implies some specific changes in program emphases in Cooperative Extension.

In addition, national priorities (1968, A People and a Spirit and 1971, 4-H in the Seventies) either hold the line or reduce emphasis on a number of traditional Extension programs in favor of the newer, more socially oriented programs.

Cooperative Extension, therefore, faces something of a dilemma created by two contrasting points of view. First, there are those persons whose perception of Extension places Extension in the role of serving agriculture and rural people through programs and services that are traditional and related primarily to meeting economic needs. On the other hand, there are those who see Extension's role as serving the total population, within the limitation of Extension's resources, through programs that are primarily designed to meet "human resource" needs of people. Although it cannot be said conclusively that these two concepts relegate themselves into a simple, mutually exclusive dichotomy of agricultural or rural vs non-agricultural or urban, the basic content of the two concepts would tend to indicate this. Of concern to the Cooperative Extension Service is the county commissioners' perception of present and proposed programs which reflect current Extension philosophy.

Three major factors, therefore, are considered to influence, directly or indirectly, county commissioners' perception and accompanying support or lack of support of Extension programs. These are competition for the tax dollar, compatibility of national and state priorities in relation to county priorities, and changes in Extension philosophy and programs resulting from social change.

County commissioners were involved as respondents in this study because they are very closely attuned to local "grass roots" level feedback of the people in the counties and their perception of Extension's programs is most vital to Extension's future. Other reasons for involving county commissioners include: (1) their county orientation provides them a basic understanding of county needs, (2) the county is the basic unit in the Cooperative Extension Service, for it is here that most programs are developed and the teaching is done (Matthews, 1960, p. 220), (3) county commissioners are among the first to be affected by changes in growth patterns in the county and, (4) a perception study involving county commissioners will compliment McCown's study (1969) involving members of the Florida Legislature, thereby providing data from two of the three sources of funding for the Cooperative Extension Service.

In summary, Cooperative Extension work has traditionally been oriented toward farm and rural non-farm people. Within the last decade several major changes have taken place in the United States that have had serious effects upon Extension's role as well as the content and clientele of Extension's programs. As Extension made efforts to change with the times, differences of opinion arose among the people concerning the changes. Although apparently not exclusively so, the differences of opinion have appeared to separate themselves into rural, agriculturally oriented vs urban, non-agriculturally oriented contexts.

Since the county commissioners represent the people in local county government they are sensitive to their opinions. If sufficient numbers of people should react adversely to Extension programs it is reasonable to assume that such adverse reaction would also be reflected in the attitudes of county commissioners. Since the Board of County Commissioners is a vital source of appropriations for the continuation of present Extension programs and the initiation of new ones, knowledge of county commissioners' perception of Extension programs is of vital importance to administrators, supervisors, and county directors of the Cooperative Extension Service.

This study was conducted, therefore, to determine the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs as reflected by county commissioners from rural and urban counties in Florida. Rural and urban counties were selected due to their environmental, economic, and social differences and to determine if there actually is a tendency toward polarization of perception of Extension programs based on rural and urban orientation.

Significance of the Study

Information provided by this study could be very beneficial to the Cooperative Extension Service as a basis for strengthening and improving the organization's effectiveness; providing a useful indication of the attitudes of county commissioners toward the Extension Service; developing a personal-social profile of county commissioners in rural and urban counties which could facilitate a better understanding of their attitudes; determining the degree to which present and proposed Extension program content and clientele are favorably regarded by county commissioners and, therefore, whether or not modifications of programs are in order; determining the need for better communication and a closer working relationship with county commissioners; and, determining whether or not Extension work can be effectively administered uniformly in rural and urban counties or if different methods and/or procedures should be employed.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of certain terms used in this study are given to clarify the material and analysis presented.

The Cooperative Extension Service is an agency created by federal and Florida legislation to provide educational opportunities in the broad areas of agriculture and home economics to the people of the State of Florida. It is known by several variations of the same name -- Extension Service, Agricultural Extension Service, Extension and Cooperative Extension.

Extension programs are those planned events coordinated by the Extension staff pursuant to Extension objectives.

Content of Extension programs refers to the subject matter of Extension programs.

Clientele of Extension programs refers to those individuals, groups of individuals, organizations, and business firms served by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Perception is the result of complex patterns of stimulation plus past experience. A process of becoming aware of objects, qualities or relations by way of the sense organs. While sensory content is always present in perception, what is perceived is influenced by set and prior experience. (Hilgard)

County commissioner is the title used to identify elected members of the county governing board.

Urban county relates to the percentage of urban population. The urban population comprises all persons living in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 inhabitants or more outside urbanized areas. More specifically the urban population consists of all persons living in (a) places of 2,500 inhabitants or more incorporated as cities, villages, and towns, but excluding those persons living in rural portions of extended cities; (b) unincorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more; and, (c) other territory, incorporated or unincorporated, included in urbanized areas (1970, Census of Population-Florida).

Rural county relates to the percentage of rural population. The population not classified as urban constitutes the rural population (1970, Census of Population-Florida).

Rural commissioner refers to a county commissioner from a rural county.

Urban commissioner refers to a county commissioner from an urban county.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study was concerned with the concept of perception. This chapter contains the Definition of Perception, Factors Influencing Perception, Findings of Related Perception Studies, Summary of Review of Literature, and the Hypotheses of the Study. The study was conducted in a social context therefore literature dealing with detailed physiological aspects of perception was omitted.

Definition of Perception

The study of perception is both old and new. Beardslee and Wertheimer (1958, p. v) claim that perception is one of the oldest areas of research in experimental psychology, yet it is still regarded as one of the three fundamental research topics, along with motivation and learning. Ittelson and Cantril (1954, p. 1) concur in stating, "The study of perception is one of the oldest as well as the most recent activities of mankind, for it is through perception that we came in contact with the world." Today, social psychologists are interested in perception as a crucial means of understanding social behavior (Sargent and Williamson, 1966, p. 217).

Perception is a complex phenomenon. In spite of the many definitions of perception that have been espoused by social scientists a specific definition is most illusive. Dember (1960, p. 24) proposes that a definition of perception is difficult for two reasons:

> First, because it depends on the role that perception plays in one's general system of psychology; second, because perception is not a simple scientific concept but a more complicated construct whose main function is to help organize knowledge and thereby facilitate communication.

In commenting on the problem of defining perception, Ittelson (1962, pp. 664-674) says:

> Men have been writing about perception ever since men have been writing, but after millennia of writing on the subject there is still no general agreement between authors as to what it is they are writing about. Those who accept disagreement among philosophers as the rule are sometimes surprised to learn that even in experimental psychology there are almost as many definitions of perception as there are writers. Even within the context of scientific psychology it cannot be assumed that the reader will have a clear and unequivocal understanding of what is referred to by the term perception, nor if he does, that it will in any way correspond to that intended by the author.
>
> We are faced, then, with the paradox that one of the oldest topics within the province of scientific psychology yet remains without a formally accepted definition. On closer examination, however, it may be that the very fact of the venerability of the study of perception accounts for its lack of definition. For psychology has in its history passed through many phases of changing emphasis and as psychology itself has grown and changed, so has the way it has posed the problem of perception. In this sense, the many definitions of perception are merely reflections of the many facets of psychology.

Hilgard (1957, pp. 336-337) feels that an effort to define perception should first place the two concepts "sensation" and "perception" in proper perspective.

> It is convenient to make a rough distinction between experiences that are very closely dependent upon specific sense-organ stimulation and those that are the result of complex patterns of stimulation plus past experience and present attitude. The former experiences can be called sensations, the latter perceptions. Thus the redness of an apple is classified as a sensation, while reaction to the whole object as an apple is classified as a perception. Once these were fighting words to psychologists, because of the issue of whether or not perceptions were composed of sensations, that is, whether the perception of the apple was made up of the sensations of

> redness, smoothness, touch, and so on.
>
> The words no longer carry this burden of controversial theory. A sensation is not something of which a perception is composed; it is a kind of perception in itself, but one arising directly from sense-organ stimulation, and corresponding closely to aspects of the stimulus. Hence sensations and perceptions do not differ in kind, but shade imperceptibly into each other along a scale of complexity, with perceptions more complexly determined by the patterning of stimuli and the influences of experiences not correlated with present stimuli.

In discussing major approaches toward a definition of perception, Ittelson (1962, pp. 664-674) states:

> Perhaps every approach to psychological theory has been reflected in a somewhat different definition of perception. These can conveniently be summarized, however, under three familiar contrasting views: the phenomenological, the stimulus-response, and the functional. Today one rarely encounters any one of these in pure form; perhaps they had best be considered as different elements which appear to greater or lesser degree and in varying combinations in most current definitions of perception.
>
> The phenomenological approach . . . attempts to define perception in terms of the subjective experience of the perceiver. It does this by taking certain aspects of conscious experience and declaring that when, and only when, these aspects are present can we properly speak of perception.
>
> In sharp distinction, a psychophysically oriented stimulus-response approach attempts to define perception in terms of observable characteristics of the stimulus and the response. On the stimulus end, this kind of definition usually simply asserts that there must be an external stimulus and then limits the kinds of stimuli acceptable.
>
> A functional definition tries to bridge the gap between these divergent views by specifying the perceptual process in terms of the relationship of that particular process to the total life functioning of the individual. A functional approach is by its very nature future-oriented and goal-directed. A functional definition puts the person into a real situation and considers him as he actually appears in concrete living.

With reference to psychology texts in current use at the time of his writing, Bartley (1958, pp. 10-12) made this observation:

> Some of them give space to the discussion of perception without giving the reader a definition which he can carry away with him. Perhaps when the reader is finished with the section on perception,

he is at a loss to put into a concise statement what perception was said to be. Several conclusions may be distilled from what is to be found in current treatments of perception in textbooks and elsewhere. It seems that authors quite customarily act in accord with the following:

1. That perception may be dealt with by general description, without necessarily introducing a formal definition for the reader. It is as though it were taken for granted that most people know pretty much, in general, what perception is, and that any further discussion of it can be carried out simply by adding new illustrative material, or new anecdotal items.
2. That when definitions are offered, they need only be fragmentary, general, and need not place perception in relation to the other processes that go to make up the individual's overall behavior.
3. That sensation may still be looked upon as an elementary process underlying perception.

In that the phenomenon of perception is very complex, it seems reasonable that the concept cannot be defined simply. Therefore, it is not too surprising that the literature contains many different definitions. Perhaps this is not all bad in that a study of numerous definitions helps create a more comprehensive appreciation and understanding of the complexity of the concept.

An understanding and appreciation of the complexity of the concept do not substitute, however, for relating the concept to the practicalities of this study. In analyzing the many different definitions of perception in the literature, the author concluded that there were at least four basic elements of commonality in the definitions. These basic elements of commonality do, in fact, relate to the practicalities of the study. They are (1) the senses, (2) the environment, (3) the individual and, (4) past experience.

Perception and the Senses

Most scientists agree with the premise that perception is a result of differing philosophies of psychology, and that the human sense organs are a vital part of the process (McCown, 1969, p. 14). As early as 1890, James (pp. 76-78) defined perception as "the consciousness of particular material things present to sense", stating that "sensational and reproductive brain-processes combined are what give us the content of our perceptions." James pointed out, however, that

> perception differs from sensation by the consciousness of farther facts associated with the object of sensation; that every perception is an acquired perception.

Dennis (1951, pp. 149-150) used the term perception to refer to an experience which is occasioned by the stimulation of sense organs.

> That is, perceptions are to be distinguished from memory images, reveries, trains of association, and hallucinations because these are not directly caused by stimulation.

A perception requires the presence of a stimulus, according to Dennis.

> However, it is generally agreed that an experience which is occasioned by a stimulus is influenced not only by the immediate stimulus but also by the reinstatement of the effects of previous stimuli. If this were not so, we would speak of sensation rather than of perception. Perception is not the result of a succession of discrete impingements from the outside world, but rather it is a continuous tuning-in, amplification, suppression, and interpretation.

Sargent and Williamson (1966, p. 212) believe that perception as a process appears even before learning in the individual's attempt to organize his behavior. His sensations gradually become structural into meaningful relationships which are the essence of perception. In a similar vein, Solley and Murphy (1960, p. 26) define perception as the structuring of stimulation. Queener (1951, p. 16) proposes that perception is an immediate interpretive response to stimuli, and, similar to others, that it is the organization which an organism gives the stimuli impinging upon him.

In discussing structural factors in perception, Morgan (1951) suggests that

> we can only see and feel what our sense organs and nervous system let us sense (p. 25); that we see with our eyes, hear with our ears, and feel with our skins, and it is obvious in each case that the structure of the sense organ has a lot to do with what we perceive through it (p. 27).

Stagner and Karwoski (1952, p. 207) say that perception is the process of obtaining knowledge of external objects and events by means of the senses, while Bartley (1958, p. 22) considers perception to be the overall activity of the organism that immediately follows or accompanies energistic impingements upon the sense organs. The sensory apparatus mediates between the more internal ongoing activities of the organism and the events outside it. To Newcomb, Turner, and Converse (1965, p. 34) perception refers, literally, to the individual's organization of sensory input--that is, to what he does psychologically with the stimuli currently impinging upon his sense organs. Hilgard (1957) also gives the senses a prominent place in perception.

> All man's information about the world comes to him by way of the senses; all stimuli impinge upon him through the sensory mechanisms. It is a central fact of human behavior that we react not to a single stimulus but to patterns of stimuli. Thus, we must distinguish between the topics of sensation and perception and discover what principles of stimulus organization underlie our perception of the world as composed of enduring, stable objects (p. 331). While sensory content is always present in perception, what is perceived is influenced by set and prior experience, so that perception is more than a passive registration of stimuli impinging on sense organs (p. 587).

In response to the question as to how perception should be defined, Allport (1955, p. 14) states:

> As a first approximation let us say that it has something to do with our awareness of the objects or conditions about us. It is dependent to a large extent upon the impressions these objects make upon our senses. It is the way things look to us, or the way they sound, feel, taste, or smell. But perception also involves, to some degree, an understanding awareness, a "meaning" or a "recognition" of these objects.

The literature reveals that social scientists are in general agreement that the role of the sense organs is important in the process of perception but that perception involves much more than simple response to stimuli.

Perception and the Environment

Webster (1947, p. 334) defines environment as the aggregate of all the external conditions and influences affecting the life and development of an organism. Bartley (1958, p. 4) suggests that perceiving has been taken to be a process by which the organism relates itself to its surroundings. In perceiving, says Bartley, the individual interprets, discriminates, and identifies objects and conditions experienced to be existing in the environment.

> Perception, whether overt or introspective, is an immediate reaction to a set of conditions that pertain now. If the reaction called a perceptual act changes something in the environment or relocates the organism in it, the next instant a new perception or apprehension of some sort is provided for (Bartley, 1958, p. 46).

Munn (1962, pp. 391-392) also relates perception to the environment:

> Perceiving is a process comparable with discriminating, differentiating, and observing. The term is customarily used to refer to relatively complex receptor and neural processes which underlie our awareness of ourselves in our world. This awareness is referred to as perception.

Describing perception as the experience of objects and events which are here, now, Boring, Langfeld, and Weld (1948, pp. 215-217) say perception is always a response to some change or difference in the environment and is the first event in the chain which leads from the stimulus to action. Hilgard (1951) believes that perception results from an interaction between within-the-organism factors and within-the-environment factors (p. 97); that perception is not a passive process or registration but an active process of interaction between organism and environment; that perception is an achievement and as in the case of other achievements it is regulated and given direction by what the organism is trying to do. Our perceptions achieve for us a world that is relatively stable by excluding so far as possible contradictory evidence (p. 103).

Blake and Ramsey (1951, p. 5) use the term perception to refer to

> those interactions between an organism and its (necessary) environment in which the form of response is governed by the signal or sign significance as contrasted with the energy strength or quality or pattern of the stimulus configuration itself. In these cases the signal or sign significance of the stimulus comes to exist (either spontaneously or effortfully) as an emergent from certain specific previous organism-environment interactions of the individual.

Beach (1951, p. 56) refers to perception as one name for a certain class of interactions between the organism and its environment while Bronfenbrenner (1951, p. 207) defines it in its broadest sense as signifying the way in which the person structures his world and himself. Allport (1955, p. 14) says we can include all the senses and can interpret perception as covering the awareness of complex environmental situations as well as of single objects.

In relating perception to a distinct personal-social context, Ittelson and Cantril (1954) propose

> that perceiving is that part of the process of living by which each one of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has his life experiences and through which he strives to gain his satisfactions (p. 5).
>
> Perception is the process by which a particular person, from his particular behavioral center attributes significances to his immediate environmental situation. And the significances which he attributes are those which he has discovered from past experiences have furthered his purpose. The perceiving process often leads one to incorrect interpretations, beliefs, and attitudes as to the significance of the environmental situation. The degree of incorrectness represents the lack of correspondence between perceptual awareness and the true environmental situation.

Perception and the Individual

The literature is quite consistent in stressing the relationship of perception to the individual.

> Each individual begins with certain physical structures, including the receptor, central, and effector nervous systems as well as the skeletal, respiratory, digestive, and other systems. These several part-systems in unitary organization constitute the more important structures involved in perception. The selective manner in which these part-systems are utilized in perception, however, is largely determined by the unique interaction between the individual and the cultural media which he has passed through and of which he is a part at present (Blake, Ramsey, and Moran, 1951, p. 9).

Hilgard (1951, p. 95) proposes that physical structures are inherited and that the inherited structures not only determine species differences in perceiving but individual differences within the species as well.

In seeking a theory of perception, Bruner (1951, pp. 123-124) takes the position that such a theory should account systematically for individual differences in the perceptual process, that

> perceiving involves a three-step cycle. Analytically, we may say that perceiving begins with an expectancy or hypothesis. The

> second analytic step in the perceiving process is the input of information from the environment. The third step in the cycle is a checking or confirmation procedure.

In support of Bruner's statement concerning perceptual individuality, Klein (1951, p. 329) says the touchstone of any personality theory is how well it accounts for differences among people.

> A given situation, particularly a social one, never is psychologically identical for different persons. Each individual perceives and interprets a situation via his sensory capacities, attention, past experience, motives, attitudes, expectations, and the like, i.e., in terms of his unique pattern of experience and personality. Objective actions are perceived in a context of personal experiences and tendencies, past and present. Perception . . . is influenced by the feelings, attitudes, and mental set of the subject. (The term "set" refers to the perceptual orientation, or the readiness to perceive a given event or range of stimuli.) In other words, one literally "sees" the world as he wishes (Sargent and Williamson, 1966, pp. 213-215).

Stated another way by Ittelson (1962, p. 677), "the world as we experience it is a product of perception, not the cause of it."

That the individual is paramount in the concept of perception was pointed out very emphatically by Ittelson and Cantril (1954, pp. 2-4) when they concluded that:

> 1. Perceptions present themselves through concrete individuals dealing with concrete situations and can be studied only in terms of transactions in which they can be observed.
>
> 2. Perceiving is always done by particular persons from their own unique position in space and time. Such perception is influenced by the person's own combination of experience and needs.
>
> 3. Within a particular transaction, and operating from his own personal point of view, each person creates for himself his own psychological environment by attributing certain aspects of his experience to an environment which he believes exists independent of the experience.

In other words, perceiving is that part of the process of living by which each of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has life's experience and through which he strives to gain satisfactions (p. 5). Bartley (1958, p. 22) agrees that in studying perception we are studying what it is that the organism experiences and not what the physical world contains or is made up of.

White (1970, p. 14) makes an interesting observation in stating that an individual is not conscious at any instance of all the external stimuli around him or of all the potential activities that might be brought to consciousness. Supporting this thought, Hartley (1952, p. 229) postulated that

> the individual ignores some stimuli, adds others, and organizes the whole so that certain stimuli are more important than others. None of us lives in direct contact with physical reality. Our eyes see as they do because of their physical and nervous structures. We do not really see the physical world. What we see is the result of the interaction between our own anatomy, the physical aspects of the universe, and what we have learned in our past experience.

Hilgard (1957, p. 389) cautions that personality characteristics, such as rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity, may determine how the individual perceives, pointing out that the satisfying of individual needs and values may lead to perceptual distortion.

Perception and Past Experience

Most social scientists give past experience a very prominent part in the total perceptual scheme. Past experience presents the framework within which the individual can relate stimulation coming from his environment to an interpretation.

Van Dalen (1966, pp. 54-55) defines perception as the art of linking what is sensed with some past experience to give the sensation meaning. Granting that perceptions may be relatively simple or highly complex, Van Dalen takes the position that man interprets his sensations in terms of past experience. Hobhouse (1969, p. 38) concurs by stating that past experiences have so prepared the mental structure that it reacts to a given stimulus with judgment. Johnson (1948, p. 186) goes a step further in proposing

> that the raw material delivered to the brain by the sense organs via sensory nerves is used and interpreted by the individual in accordance with his past experience and in furtherance of whatever activities he may be engaged in at the moment.

Blake and Ramsey (1951) consider that a person's reaction

> is determined by the meaning the individual's prior experience have given to the stimulus configuration (p. 5). The most important adjustments of the individual are not the consequence of the direct effect on the organism of stimulus energies or stimulus patterns. Rather, human behavior is governed by learned interpretations or implications assigned on the basis of experience to configurations of stimulus energies (p. 8).
>
> The way one sees reality is contingent not only on the capacity of his given physical structure for detecting stimulus configurations and integrating information about stimuli but also on modifications in the use of the structure which derive from the impact of the experience. The summed effects result in the individual's having more or less appropriate response patterns ready in order to cope with each of a myriad of specific stimulus configurations (p, 9).

The authors concede, however, that perception is not altogether the product of past experiences, for perception is a developmental product, an ongoing process.

In reference to the transactional theory of perception, one of thirteen theories listed by Allport (1955), Bartley (1958, p. 17) says the theory involves the recognition that past experience plays an important role in perceiving. This pertains not only to specific objects but to the nature of the world in which the organism finds itself. Certain assumptions, as it were, result, according to Bartley, and perception occurs in accord with these. Dember (1960, p. 7) cautions, however, that the assumptions that the individual develops in the course of his transactions with his environment lead him astray in special circumstances, as he does not see things the way they really are but rather in ways that are compatible with his assumptions.

Gault and Delton (1925, p. 181) support the theory that perception in general rests upon the residue of the experiences the individual has had with his world and that their form is affected by the mental state and content that prevail at the time. Gault and Delton describe perception as a reflection on one's nature, chiefly of one's acquired nature, while Klausmier (1961, p. 7) refers to perception as a sensation "together with a context of other experiences that give it meaning."

There is an old proverb that "it's hard to tell where you are unless you know where you've been." This thought would seem to relate to perception and past experience.

Factors Influencing Perception

Based upon an extensive review of the literature, it is obvious that perception is influenced by many factors. Basically, these factors may be classified as internal and external. Sherif and Sherif (1956, pp. 79-80) spoke to this point:

> Perceptual structuring is not only a "cognitive" affair. It is jointly determined by the totality of functionally related external factors and internal factors coming into the structuring process at a given time. The external factors are stimulating situations outside of the individual--objects, events, other persons, groups, cultural products, and the like. The internal factors are motives, emotions, attitudes, general states of the organism, effects of past experience, etc.

Krech *et al*. (1962, p. 25) take a similar stand:

> Only certain objects, among all the objects that are "out there", enter into the individual's conception of the outside world. And the characteristics of these objects may be "distorted" to fit his physiological requirements. The selective organization of cognition is determined by two interacting sets of factors: stimulus factors

> and personal factors. By stimulus factors are meant those which derive from the nature of the stimulus object, e.g., frequency and intensity. Personal factors are those which derive from the characteristics of the perceiving individual, e.g., his wants, emotions, and mental sets, as he strives to construct a meaningful world.

Kahn and Cannell (1957, pp. 36-37) add further emphasis to the internal-external viewpoint by asserting that "the way one sees the world or anything in it depends only in part upon external objective reality, and for the rest upon individual needs, goals, motives, and past experiences." Bartley (1958) refers to the influence of factors represented in the observer himself as important in the determination of perception, including such factors as set, stance, and others (p. 89). On the other hand, he also points out that the relationship between perception and the quantification of stimulation is another aspect of perceptual development (p. 91). Cantril (1957, pp. 119-126) described perceiving as a "transaction" between the perceiver and the perceived, a process of negotiation in which the perceptual end product is a result both of influences within the perceiver and of characteristics of the perceived.

Bonner (1953, pp. 96-97) groups factors influencing perception under three major categories: (1) functional, (2) structural, and (3) cultural determinants.

> The functional aspects of perception are those properties which are affected by the person's social-psychological organization--by his memory, needs, habits, and past experience.
>
> The structural determinants of perception are physiological in character, so that we perceive the natural world around us as we do by virtue of the neuro-physiological character of the organs of perception and learning. They are constituted, furthermore, by the physical qualities of the perceived object.
>
> The cultural determinants of perception are those factors which cause us to see the world in terms of customs, traditions, and ideals.

With reference to structural factors in perception, Morgan

(1951, pp. 53-54) proposes that certain anatomical structures have a bearing on perception. He lists aging, brain injury, and body chemistry as being involved.

Concerning social and cultural factors, Sargent and Williamson (1966, pp. 214-216) state that perception is influenced by the feelings, attitudes, and mental set of the subject as well as by the social standards or "norms" and verbal and numerical symbols. Intelligence, education, occupation, religion, and geographic background are all listed as conditioning influences in the interpretation of reality.

Many authors relate factors influencing perception to the individual and his own particular needs and values. In 1958, Bruner (pp. 85-94) described what he called the "New Look" in perception as one in which personal determinants of the perceptual process were being stressed. He showed the importance of such subjective influences as needs, values, cultural background, and interests on the perceptual process. Many others concur with Bruner in regard to personal factors influencing perception. Sargent and Williamson (1966, p. 213) state that each individual perceives and interprets a situation via his sensory capacities, attention, past experience, motives, attitudes, expectations, feelings, and mental sets; that is, in terms of his unique pattern of experience and personality.

The fact that emotions and personal needs of the perceiver influence perception is clearly pointed out by Krech and Crutchfield (1948, p. 7):

> There are no "impartial facts." Data do not have a logic of their own that results in the same perceptions and cognitions for all people. Data are perceived and interpreted in terms of the individual perceiver's own needs, own emotions, own personality, own previously formed cognitive patterns.

Values, another personal characteristic, have a definite influence on one's perception according to Postman _et_ _al_. (1948, p. 43):

> The perceiver, whatever the nature of the stimulus, favors the presolution hypotheses which reflect his value orientation. He will, therefore, perceive more readily stimulus objects which lie within the same value area as his preferred presolution hypothesis.

Taking a different approach, Zalkind and Costello (1964, pp. 33-34) suggest that when trying to determine some of the factors that influence perception it is necessary, rather, to consider what influences distort one's perceptions and judgments of the outside world. They cite the work of Johnson (1945, pp. 193-224) who suggested the following about the perceiver:

1. He may be influenced by considerations that he may not be able to identify, responding to cues that are below the threshold of his awareness.
2. When required to form difficult perceptual judgments, he may respond to irrelevant cues to arrive at a judgment.
3. In making abstract or intellectual judgments, he may be influenced by emotional factors--what is liked is perceived as correct.
4. He will weigh perceptual evidence coming from respected (or favored) sources more heavily than that coming from other sources.
5. He may not be able to identify all the factors on which his judgments are based.

Zalkind and Costello caution that these considerations do not imply that we respond only to the subtle or irrelevant cues or to emotional factors. We often perceive on the basis of the obvious, but we are quite likely to be responding as well to the less obvious or less objective. The authors point out that one of the most important of the subjective factors that influence the way we perceive is set. Hilgard (1957, p. 389) believes that the satisfying of individual needs and values may lead to perceptual distortion. Personality characteristics, such as rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity, may likewise determine how the individual perceives, according to Hilgard.

In discussing further obstacles to accurate observation or perception, Van Dalen (1966, p. 55) suggests that the possibility of perceptual error is always present when the observer makes inferences on the basis of scanty sensory cues.

> Anticipation of an event can also cause him to make a faulty inference. Strong personal interests tend to make one see only those things he wants to see. Perceptions, therefore, are subject to distortions because of the observer's emotions, motivations, prejudices, mental sets, sense of values, physical condition, and errors of inference.

Past experience is given a prominent place by many authors as an important factor that influences perception. According to Blake and Ramsey (1951, p. 7),

> an individual's perceptual activity must be fabricated from his current organization of personally meaningful and significant experiences. These integrations, which achieve conceptual representation in the form of the individual's unique organization of internal sets, beliefs, attitudes, selector tendencies, or hypotheses, are derived from the ascientific techniques of knowing adapted from the past for use in achieving a stable, definite and predictable present.

Cantril (1967, p. 284) introduces somewhat different terminology in stating that

> our perception depends in large part on the assumptions we bring to any particular occasion. This implies that the meanings and significancies we assign to things, to symbols, to people, and to events are the meanings and significances we have built up through our past experience, and are not inherent or intrinsic in the "stimulus" itself.

Smith and Smith (1958, pp. 223-224) present the concept of perception in total response, pointing out that the organization of the perceptual world is due to several different factors. The cerebral cortex itself is a remarkable integrative mechanism, they say, enabling the individual to react to many distinct sensory impulses in an orderly and meaningful way.

> Then, too, the perceptual world is organized in terms of past experiences and learning. But there are other more immediate factors that help determine what the individual shall perceive and how he shall perceive it--namely, the individual's emotional states, his needs and drives. Perception interacts with all other phases of behavior to determine total response.

Straughn (1963, p. 16) suggests several factors which influence the individual's perception: (1) the sensitivity and effectiveness of an individual's sense organs, (2) set and prior experiences and the accompanying mental structure developed in each individual, (3) ability to interpret new experiences by associating or relating them to past experiences, (4) strength of stimulus impingement on the perceiver, and (5) memory or ability to recall.

Findings of Related Perception Studies

Fifteen perception studies related to the Cooperative Extension Service were reviewed in this study. Five of the studies involved county commissioners as respondents (Horne, Utah, 1965; White, North Carolina, 1965; Campbell, Oklahoma, 1968; Dowell, Oklahoma, 1970; and Torrance, Georgia, 1970), four involved state legislators (Blalock, North Carolina, 1963; Smith, North Carolina, 1967; McCown, Florida, 1969; and White, Alabama, 1970), four involved respondents engaged in commercial agriculture and/or agribusiness (Lawson, California cotton farm operators, 1959; Griffith, Kansas formula feed operators, 1961; Amburgey, Arizona commercial fertilizer manufacturer and distributor representatives, 1962; and Cavender, Alabama meat packers and processors, 1964), and two involved Cooperative Extension advisory committees (Biever, Wisconsin, 1957; and Moore, Montana, 1962.

In the review of literature concerning the above studies, only those aspects of the studies relating to Extension program content (subject matter areas) and clientele were regarded as relating directly to this study.

Content (Subject Matter) of Extension Programs

The data in Table 1 show rank order comparisons of nine Extension program areas as perceived by groups studied by Blalock, Amburgey, Griffith, Moore, Cavender, and White. The nine program areas listed are broad program areas identified in the Extension publication The Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement on Scope and Responsibility (1958) and around which many state Cooperative Extension Service programs have been developed.

In addition to ranking the nine program areas according to perceived importance, Griffith (1961, pp. 70-72) also asked the Kansas formula feed operators to give their opinion as to whether the county Extension agents should place more effort and emphasis, the same, or less on each of the nine basic program areas. Only three program areas, farm and home management, training and developing leaders, and community development were rated as needing more emphasis by more than fifty percent of the respondents. Livestock and crop production, soil, water, and grass conservation, family living, 4-H Club work and youth development, and public policies and affairs were rated as needing the same emphasis by more than fifty percent of the respondents. Marketing of farm products was rated by forty six percent of the respondents as needing more emphasis, and by ten percent as needing less emphasis. Family living was rated as needing more emphasis by only eighteen percent of the respondents.

TABLE 1 .--Rank order comparisons of relative importance on nine Extension program areas as perceived by clientele groups

Program Area	Rank Order					
	1961 Griffith	1962 Moore	1962 Amburgey	1963 Blalock	1964 Cavender	1965 White
Youth development and 4-H Club work	2	1	6	4	2	5
Efficiency in agricultural production	1	2	1	2	1	1
Conservation of natural resources	3	4	3	3	4	2
Leadership development	4	3	7	7	7	6
Management of the farm and home	5	9	2	5	6	4
Marketing of farm products	6	5	4	1	3	3
Community and resource development	7	6	8	8	8	7
Public affairs	8	8	5	9	5	8
Family living	9	7	9	6	9	9

Amburgey (1962, pp. 58-61) also asked the commercial fertilizer manufacturer and distributor representatives to rate the same nine program areas in terms of the emphasis being given at that time to each area. Conservation, wise use and development of natural resources and public policies were the only areas which were rated as being under-emphasized by fifty percent of the respondents. Family living was rated as under-emphasized by only 12.1 percent while 54.4 percent felt that the emphasis was about right. More than 66 percent of the respondents rated the degree of emphasis on 4-H Club work and youth development as about right while 17.6 percent rated it as under-emphasized.

Dowell (1970, pp. 64-66) presented a comparison of the importance county commissioners and county Extension staffs placed on each of the nine program areas in relation to the amount of time and effort county staffs reported spending on each area. Agricultural production was rated of first importance by county commissioners and also by county staffs in terms of actual time and effort spent in the area. Youth development was rated second in importance by both groups. Agreement was rather high throughout, except in leadership development and family living. Commissioners viewed leadership development as having third highest priority while county staffs ranked it sixth. On the other hand, county staffs ranked family living third while commissioners ranked it eighth. County staffs ranked agricultural production, youth development, and family living first, second, and third, respectively, which obviously, states Dowell, concurs with the three major program categories in each county--agriculture, 4-H, and home economics. Both groups considered public affairs least important of the nine program areas listed.

Smith (1967, pp. 97-100), McCown (1969, pp. 51-56), and White

(1970, p. 68) all conducted perceptual studies concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and involving state legislators from North Carolina, Florida, and Alabama, respectively. Rather than seeking a rank order of the program areas per se, these investigators showed the legislators a list of the nine Scope Report program areas and asked them to indicate the three program areas they perceived as the most important and the three that were the least important to the welfare of their constituents.

The three program areas perceived to be the most important by the North Carolina legislators were conservation of natural resources, marketing of farm products, and efficiency in agriculture. The three least important program areas were family living, public affairs, and community and resource development.

The Alabama legislators considered the most important program areas to be conservation of natural resources, agricultural production, and marketing, distribution and utilization of agricultural products. The three least important program areas were leadership development, community improvement and resource development, and public affairs.

The largest number of Florida legislators perceived agricultural production and marketing, distribution, and utilization of agricultural products to be the two most important program areas with an equal number of legislators selecting conservation of natural resources and farm management as a third. Leadership development, community improvement and resource development, and public affairs were selected by more than fifty percent of the legislators as least important. Twenty percent of the Florida legislators felt more emphasis should be placed on conservation of natural resources as a program area while only four percent thought the program areas "leadership development" and "public affairs" had been over-emphasized.

Biever (1957, pp. 91-93), Lawson (1959, pp. 125-126), and Torrance (1970, pp. 36-38) chose a different approach to the determination of their respondents' perception of Extension programs. Each developed his own list of subject matter areas in contrast to using the nine Scope Report areas per se.

Biever asked each Extension advisory committee respondent to indicate the amount of emphasis which should be placed on twenty different subject matter areas as they perceived the need of emphasis in the county. Dairy cattle management ranked first, field crops second, soil management and farm management tied for third, foods and nutrition ranked fifth, health and safety sixth, and home management and home furnishings ranked seventh. Biever explained that as most of the agricultural committee ranking the program areas were farmers, one would expect them to attach a higher degree of importance to subject matter areas related to agriculture than homemaking.

Lawson asked commercial cotton farmers to express their thinking as to the emphasis that various subject matter areas should receive compared to what was then being done in the county. Fifteen subject matter areas were listed and the respondents were asked to read them over and indicate whether they would like to see more emphasis, about the same emphasis, or less emphasis on each subject matter area. With the exception of marketing farm products, over fifty percent of the respondents expressed "about the same emphasis" for each of the program areas. A substantial number, however, felt that more emphasis should be placed on plant diseases and insect control, consumer education, public affairs, farm management, soil management, and cropping practices.

Torrance was concerned only with selected program areas relating to home economics work. County commission chairmen established a rank order of Torrance's nine program areas as shown in Table 2. Over half of the county commission chairmen selected three program areas that should receive "much" consideration. These were "foods and nutrition," "leadership and citizenship," and "health and safety." "Foods and nutrition" was chosen by seventy five percent of the county commission chairmen to receive "much" consideration while another twenty four percent of the commissioners thought it should receive "some" consideration.

Horne (1965, p. 35) mailed questionnaires to county commissioners and Extension agents in eighteen counties in Utah. The respondents were asked to indicate the importance they placed on the nine Scope Report program areas plus one additional one, "adult education." The rank order established by the respondents is shown in Table 3.

Clientele of Extension Programs

The data in Table 4 show rank order comparisons of ten clientele groups by Griffith (1961), Moore (1962), and Amburgey (1962) and eleven clientele groups by Blalock (1963), White (1965), Horne (1965), and Dowell (1970). In all of the studies except that of Amburgey, respondents were asked to indicate the amount of time and effort they felt Extension should spend with each of the clientele groups. Amburgey asked respondents to rate Extension's responsibility to the various clientele groups.

Other studies relating to Extension clientele were conducted by Lawson (1959), Smith (1967), Campbell (1968), White (1970), and Torrance

TABLE 2 .--Rank order comparison of relative importance of selected Extension home economics program areas as perceived by Georgia county commission chairmen and Extension jury

Program Area	Rank Order	
	County Commission Chairmen	Extension Jury
Foods and nutrition	1	1
Leadership and citizenship	2	3
Clothing	3.5	2
Health and safety	3.5	6
Management and consumer competence	5	5
Human development	6	7
Family housing	7	8
Household equipment and furnishings	8	4
Cultural arts	9	9

TABLE 3 .--Rank order comparison of relative importance of selected Extension program areas as perceived by Utah county commissioners and Extension agents

Program Areas	Rank Order	
	County Commissioners	Extension Agents
Youth development and 4-H Club work	1.5	1
Efficiency in agricultural production	1.5	4.5
Marketing, distribution, and utilization of farm products	3	4.5
Conservation, wise use, and development of natural resources	4	8
Leadership development	5	3
Management on the farm and in the home	6	2
Community and resource development	7	6
Adult education programs	8	9
Public affairs	9	10
Family living	10	7

TABLE 4.--Rank order comparisons of relative amount of time Extension should spend with selected clientele groups

Clientele Groups	Rank Order						
	1961 Griffith	1962 Moore	1962 Amburgey[1]	1963 Blalock	1965 White	1965 Horne	1970 Dowell
Farm							
Average family size farms	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Small subsistence farms	2	3	3	2	2	2	1
Large commercial farms	5	7	5	3.5	4	5	4
Farm organizations	3	4	2	5	3	3	3
Part-time farms	6	2	6	6	7	6.5	6
Non-Farm							
Agricultural marketing firms	*	*	*	3.5	5	4	7
Businesses supplying farmers	4	5	4	7	6	8	5
Towns and village families	8	6	7	8	8	6.5	8
Rural non-farm families	7	8	9	9	9	9	9
Businesses serving all consumers	9	10	8	10	10	10	11
Urban and city families	10	9	10	11	11	11	10

[1] Extension's responsibility to clientele was rated

*Not reported

(1970).

When Lawson asked if the commercial cotton farm operators in California thought Extension should provide educational assistance to commercial organizations who deal directly with the farmer, ninety-eight percent of the respondents answered affirmatively. Ninety four percent said they thought Extension should provide educational assistance to farm organizations, commodity groups, etc. Opinion as to Extension's responsibilities to non-farm families was less decisive, although a convincing majority of respondents (seventy two percent) felt that Extension should work with these people if it did not require personal visits from the farm advisor.

Smith showed North Carolina legislators a card listing several clientele groups that might seek Extension's assistance from time to time or around which Extension might develop programs. Each legislator was then asked to indicate the relative amount of time which he felt Extension should devote to each of these groups. The clientele were grouped into (1) farm clientele which included large commercial farms, small subsistence farms, part-time farmers, and farm organizations; and, (2) non-farm clientele which included businesses serving farmers, agricultural marketing firms, businesses serving all consumers, rural non-farm families, town and village families, and urban families.

Legislators' responses showed a significant association between size of business or farm the legislator was associated with and the relative amount of time they felt Extension should devote to large commercial farms. Well over half (fifty five percent) of the respondents associated with large enterprises felt that Extension personnel should spend a "great deal or most" of their time with this group.

Approximately one-fourth of those legislators connected with small or medium size enterprises felt the large commercial farms were entitled to this much time.

There appeared to be a trend in the direction of greater importance being attached to the small subsistence farms as the legislators' urban orientation increased. This conclusion was supported by the fact that a much higher percentage of the legislators perceiving their county or district as being evenly divided (fifty five percent) or mostly urban (sixty six percent) felt that Extension personnel should spend a "great deal or most" of their time with the small subsistence farms than was the case with those legislators perceiving their constituency as mostly rural or completely rural. The same trend was evidenced with respect to the legislators' place of residence. Sixty one percent of the legislators from towns of 5,000 - 24,999 population and fifty nine percent of those in the city over 25,000 category were of the opinion that Extension personnel should spend a "great deal or most" of their time with the small subsistence farms. Only about forty one percent of the legislators from rural farms or villages with populations of less than 5,000 felt that the organization should devote this much time to this group.

So far as the non-farm clientele group was concerned, the legislators' responses indicated that degree of involvement with the Extension Service exerted by far the greatest influence on legislators' perception in this area. The association pattern was in the direction of the higher the degree of involvement the more importance the respondents attached to the non-farm groups as being Extension clientele. The one exception related to businesses serving all consumers. Legislators with a low degree of Extension involvement perceived businesses serving all consumers as a moderately important clientele group. Those who had a medium amount of involvement with Extension perceived this type of business as entitled to little or none of Extension's time. As the legislators' involvement continued to increase, however, the importance they attached to Extension's working with this group increased to approximately the same level as that held by the low involvement category.

Legislators' perception of the type of county or district they represented was the second most important influence on perception regarding non-farm clientele. With the exception of businesses serving farmers and businesses serving all consumers there was a tendency for the legislators who perceived their county or district as completely rural to attach the greatest importance to the non-farm groups as being Extension clientele. The legislators who perceived their constituency to be mostly urban felt that, with the exception of businesses serving all consumers, Extension should spend the least amount of time with the non-farm clientele groups. Legislators who perceived their county or district to be evenly divided (rural-urban) were the ones who felt Extension should spend the most time working with businesses serving all consumers. In contrast, legislators who perceived their county or district as being completely rural or mostly urban were the ones who felt that Extension should spend the least amount of time with this non-farm clientele group.

The legislators' place of residence was significantly associated with their perception relative to non-farm clientele only in the case of businesses serving farmers. A higher percentage of the legislators who resided on rural farms perceived this clientele group to be entitled to a "great deal or most" of Extension's time than was true with any of the other residence categories.

Size of farm or business with which the legislators were associated was significantly associated with perception of the amount of time Extension should spend with non-farm clientele groups only in the case of agricultural marketing firms. Those legislators associated with medium and large size enterprises felt that Extension should spend a "great deal or most" of the time working with these firms. Only twenty one percent of those legislators who were associated with small units felt that Extension should spend this much time with agricultural marketing firms.

Neither the legislators' length of legislative service nor occupation showed a significant association with perception of the relative amount of time that Extension should spend with non-farm clientele groups.

Campbell (1968) asked Oklahoma county commissioners to select from a list of seven clientele groups the one they felt would benefit most from specialized Agricultural Extension help. The list included small, subsistence type farmers; average size family type farmers; agricultural business firms; larger commercial farmers; agricultural marketing firms; part-time farmers; farm organizations; and, there was provision for "no response." Data indicated that the commissioners felt that average size family farmers would receive the most benefit from specialized Extension help in agriculture, followed by larger commercial farmers. None of the other clientele groups listed were chosen by more than 9.1 percent of the commissioners.

White (1970) asked Alabama legislators to indicate the amount of time and effort the Cooperative Extension Service should spend with each of fourteen clientele groups, in contrast to the time and effort the clientele groups were then receiving. The rank order distribution of responses for increased emphasis is shown in Table 5.

Torrance (1970) conducted a study to determine Georgia county commission chairmen's perception of the home economics phase of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service program. He also involved a Cooperative Extension Service jury as respondents. The rank order of responses regarding time and effort Extension home economists should spend with selected clientele groups is shown in Table 6.

Over half of the county commission chairmen indicated "much" time and effort should be spent with "4-H Clubs and youth," "low income and disadvantaged families," "rural farm families," "homemakers with young children," and "young newly married homemakers."

Eighty two percent of the county commission chairmen and sixty eight percent of the jury indicated that "much" time and effort should be devoted to "4-H Clubs and youth." "Four-H Clubs and youth" ranked highest among clientele groups by both county commission chairmen and Extension jury. "Low income and disadvantaged families" was ranked second by the county commission chairmen with sixty six percent indicating "much" for the relative priority to be given. This group was ranked seventh by the jury.

"Rural farm families" and "homemakers with young children" were the next two ranking clientele groups for both the commissioners and jury. "Organized home economics clubs" should receive "much" time and effort according to forty three percent of the county commission chairmen but only twenty four percent of the jury indicated "much."

TABLE 5 .--Rank order distribution of amount of time and effort Extension should spend with selected clientele groups as perceived by Alabama legislators

Clientele Groups	Rank Order Distribution
Small subsistence farms	1
Primarily farmers and farm families	2
Average size family farms	3.5
Agricultural marketing firms	3.5
Rural farm families	5
Town and village families	6
Businesses supplying farmers	7
Rural non-farm families	8
Agricultural organizations	9
Urban and city families	10.5
All segments of society	10.5
Large commercial farms	12.5
Businesses serving all consumers	12.5
Part-time farms	14

TABLE 6 .--Rank order comparisons of relative importance of Extension home economics clientele groups as perceived by Georgia county commission chairmen and Extension jury

Clientele Groups	Rank Order	
	County Commission Chairmen	Extension Jury
4-H Clubs and youth	1	1
Low income and disadvantaged families	2	7
Rural farm families	3	2.5
Homemakers with young children	4	4
Young newly married homemakers	5	8
Organized home economics clubs	6	11
Rural non-farm families	7	6
Small town and village families	8.5	5
Special classes or interest groups	8.5	2.5
Urban or city families	10	9
Older homemakers and retired people	11	12
Working women	12	10

"Organized home economics clubs" was ranked sixth by the commissioners but next to the lowest (eleventh) by the jury. "Rural non-farm families" and "small town and village families" were viewed as the next most important clientele groups in terms of Extension home economists' time and effort expended in their behalf according to county commission chairmen. These groups were rated slightly higher in this respect by the jury than by the commissioners. The jury ranked "special classes or interest groups" relatively high (2.5) but this group was rated much lower (8.5) by the commissioners.

"Urban or city families," "older homemakers and retired people," and "working women" were perceived by the commissioners to be the lowest ranking groups (tenth, eleventh, and twelfth) from the point of view of the county Extension home economists' time expenditure. Only ten to twenty percent of the commissioners indicated "much" for the relative priority these groups should receive. The jury also gave these three clientele groups the lower priorities.

According to Torrance, even though differences in ranking were very evident for some clientele groups, the general level of agreement between county commission chairmen and the Extension jury was relatively high. The widest disagreement was shown for the clientele groups "special classes or interest groups," "organized home economics clubs," and "low income and disadvantaged families." Over one-fourth of the county commission chairmen indicated that "none" or "not much" consideration should be given "urban or city families," "older homemakers and retired people," and "working women."

Summary

This chapter has presented a review of literature establishing a framework for the definition of perception as used in this study. A discussion of the factors influencing perception has also been included.

In summary, the following points seem to be important in choosing a definition of perception for use in analyzing, understanding, interpreting, and describing perceptual differences observed in this study:

1. Perception involves the senses. All man's information about the world around him (his environment) comes to him by way of the senses. We react, however, not to a single stimulus but to patterns of stimuli.
2. Since perception involves the senses, it is an individual matter. Therefore, there may be as many different perceptions as there are individuals.
3. Perception involves not only receiving stimuli but interpreting and describing these stimuli in terms that are meaningful to the individual in the light of past experience.
4. Perception must be considered and dealt with in terms of what the organism actually experiences and not necessarily what the physical world contains, or is made up of.
5. Various internal and external factors may profoundly influence both the interpretation of the stimulus and the response it is likely to provoke.
6. Perception is a dynamic, cumulative phenomenon that may be continually changing within the organism.

The definition by Hilgard, as cited earlier, appeared to essentially meet all of these criteria.

Fifteen perceptual studies similar to this study were reviewed. Each study contained one or more of the elements of perception included in this study. The findings were presented and discussed. Differences and similarities in the findings were noted.

Hypotheses of the Study

Within the context of the theoretical concept of perception, with a knowledge of the results of fifteen similar studies, and in pursuit of the objectives of this study, the following hypotheses are presented:

1. There is no significant difference between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning the following eight selected personal and social characteristics: (1) number of years as a commissioner (tenure), (2) main occupation, (3) level of education, (4) age, (5) residential background, (6) involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, (7) perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county, and (8) familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service.

2. There is no association between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work).

3. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

4. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

5. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

6. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

7. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

8. There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research procedures used in this study. Sections included in this chapter are Population, Preparation of the Instrument, Pretesting the Instrument, Collection of Data, and Analysis of Data.

Population

Respondents in this study were county commissioners from thirty counties in Florida. The counties were divided into two groups, the fifteen most rural counties and the fifteen most urban counties according to definition given in the 1970 Census of Population-Florida. In actuality, however, the sixteen most rural and the sixteen most urban counties were involved because one county in each group refused to participate, causing the researcher to move to the next county in order. All counties involved had active Extension agricultural, home economics, and youth programs within the immediate past twelve months prior to the survey. The total population was 166 county commissioners. One hundred and fifty county commissioners participated in the study, providing a 90.3 percent response. A majority of county commissioners responded in each county. The study included the total population, rather than a sample.

Preparation of the Instrument

A questionnaire composed of three parts was developed for this study. The first part was designed to identify selected personal and social characteristics (independent variables) of the county commissioners. The second part was designed to determine county commissioners' perception (dependent variable) of the relative importance of selected Extension program content. The third part was designed to determine county commissioners' perception (dependent variable) of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele. Both program content and clientele were presented under sub-headings of agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work). With one possible exception (main occupation), the entire questionnaire was structured such that the respondent merely checked or circled his choice of an answer. There were no open-end questions. Questionnaires from several previous studies were reviewed. The questionnaire involved in this study followed the type used by Torrance (1970).

Pretesting the Instrument

The questionnaire was reviewed by three Florida Cooperative Extension Service district agents, four members of the Extension program development and evaluation staff, and revised three times before pretesting. The instrument was pretested in July, 1972, by four county commissioners in each of two different counties. After completing the questionnaire the county commissioners were asked if the questionnaire were clear and understandable. They all responded affirmatively with only one minor consideration suggested by one county commissioner. The questionnaire was then analyzed further and prepared in final form.

Collection of Data

The County Extension Director in each of the counties involved in the study was supplied with questionnaires, complete with instructions and an envelope in which to seal the completed questionnaire, to take to the County Manager, County Administrator, or Clerk for the Board of County Commissioners and request his assistance in administering the questionnaire directly to the county commissioners. This system worked very well with only few exceptions prompting the researcher to administer the questionnaire directly to the county commissioners. A district agent colleague administered the questionnaire to two county commissioners in one county in his district. The questionnaires were returned to the writer by mail except in those few instances in which they were collected directly by the researcher or his colleague.

Analysis of Data

The questionnaires were pre-coded for computer tabulation. Upon receipt of the completed questionnaires they were edited for completeness. When all questionnaires were collected the data were punched onto IBM cards and analyzed at the University of Florida's Computing Center. The instrument was designed to allow responses to be quantified to provide greater use of statistical techniques in the interpretation of the data.

Statistical techniques employed included frequency distributions, percentages, the chi-square test, and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. A simple scoring system was used to place a quantitative value on replies that were primarily of a qualitative nature. The following illustration is an example of the system employed:

1 - unimportant

2 - not very important

3 - neutral

4 - important

5 - very important

Where rank orders were desired they were based on total scores which were obtained by multiplying the number of respondents selecting a particular response times its assigned value.

Frequency distributions and percentages were used to present the various elements of the county commissioners' personal data as well as the elements of perception by county commissioners from both rural and urban counties. Rank order scores were used for comparison between rural and urban counties, using Spearman's rho for rank correlation (Siegel, 1956, pp. 202-213). The chi-square test was used to test the significance of relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Statistical analysis was based upon the .05 level of significance; however, all probability values for Chi square have been indicated in the tables.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to identify and compare eight selected personal and social characteristics of county commissioners from Florida's fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties; to describe the perceptions of the county commissioners from both rural and urban counties concerning the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs; and, to present data testing the eight hypotheses identified in Chapter II.

Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners

Introduction

This section identifies and compares eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioner respondents involved in the study.

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no significant difference between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning the following eight selected personal and social characteristics: (1) number of years as a commissioner (tenure), (2) main occupation, (3) level of education, (4) age, (5) residential background, (6) involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, (7) perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county and, (8) familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service.

Tenure as a County Commissioner

Over one-half of the commissioners from urban counties had served less than four years as opposed to one-third of the commissioners from rural counties. Thirty seven percent of the commissioners from rural counties had served between four and eight years as opposed to approximately twenty seven percent of the commissioners from urban counties. Twenty nine percent of the commissioners from rural counties had served over eight years while approximately twenty percent of the commissioners from urban counties had served over eight years.

As shown in Table 7, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to tenure as a county commissioner cannot be rejected.

TABLE 7.--Classification of County Commissioners by Tenure

Tenure-years	Rural Frequency (number)	Rural Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency (number)	Urban Distribution (percent)
Less than 4 years	24	33.3	41	52.6
4 to 8 years	27	37.5	21	26.9
Over 8 years	21	29.2	16	20.5
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 5.641$ d.f. = 2   Not Significant at .05 level

Main Occupation

A factor that might logically have considerable influence upon a county commissioner's perception is his main or primary occupation. Approximately sixty one percent of the county commissioners from rural counties were engaged in occupations relating to agriculture whereas this was true for only about fourteen percent of the commissioners from urban counties. Almost one-half of the commissioners from urban counties were non-agricultural businessmen while approximately twenty percent of the commissioners from rural counties were engaged in non-agricultural business as a main occupation. Approximately thirteen percent of the commissioners from rural counties were engaged in professional occupations as contrasted to nineteen percent of those from urban counties.

As shown in Table 8, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to main occupation can be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE 8.--Classification of county commissioners by main occupation

Main Occupation	Rural Frequency Distribution (number)	 (percent)	Urban Frequency Distribution (number)	 (percent)
Businessman (non-agricultural)	14	19.5	38	48.7
Businessman (agricultural related)	15	20.8	8	10.3
Farmer	29	40.3	3	3.9
Professional	9	12.5	15	19.2
Other	5	6.9	14	17.9
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 39.919$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .01 level

Level of Formal Education

Almost seventy one percent of the commissioners from rural counties had a high school education or less. Eighteen percent attended college less than four years while only eleven percent attended college four or more years. In contrast, approximately twenty two percent of the commissioners from urban counties had a high school education or less while about thirty six percent attended college less than four years and forty two percent attended college four or more years.

As shown in Table 9, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to level of formal education can be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE 9.--Classification of county commissioners by level of formal education

Level of Formal Education	Rural Frequency Distribution (number)	Rural Frequency Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency Distribution (number)	Urban Frequency Distribution (percent)
Less than high school	24	33.3	2	2.6
High school but no college	27	37.5	15	19.2
Some college but less than 4 years	13	18.1	28	35.9
Four years or more of college	8	11.1	33	42.3
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 42.604$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

Age

Over eighty percent of the county commissioners from both rural and urban counties were between thirty one and sixty years of age. A relatively small number of commissioners from both rural and urban counties were thirty years of age or younger while a slightly higher percentage of commissioners from rural counties were over sixty years of age.

As shown in Table 10, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to age cannot be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 10.--Classification of county commissioners by age

Age	Rural Frequency (number)	Rural Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency (number)	Urban Distribution (percent)
45 years or younger	22	30.6	35	44.8
46 to 60 years	38	52.8	35	44.8
61 years or older	12	16.6	8	10.4
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 3.654$ d.f. = 2 Not Significant at .05 level

Residential Background

Approximately eighty eight percent of the commissioners from rural counties stated they had spent the most significant portion of their life either on a farm or in a rural non-farm environment. In contrast, only about twenty two percent of the commissioners from urban counties were in this category. On the other hand, sixty nine percent of the commissioners from urban counties spent the most significant portion of their life in towns with a population of over 10,000 persons. Less than two percent of the commissioners from rural counties were in this category. A comparable percentage of commissioners from both rural and urban counties said they spent the most significant portion of their life in towns with a population up to 10,000 persons.

As shown in Table 11, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to residential background can be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE 11.--Classification of county commissioners by residential background

Residential Background	Rural Frequency (number)	Rural Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency (number)	Urban Distribution (percent)
On a farm	39	54.2	7	9.0
Rural, but not on a farm	24	33.3	10	12.8
Town up to 10,000 persons	8	11.1	7	9.0
Town over 10,000 persons	1	1.4	54	69.2
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 79.051$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

Involvement in Extension Programs and/or Activities

A factor that could logically be considered to influence a county commissioner's perception of Cooperative Extension Service programs is the degree to which he has been directly involved in Extension programs and activities. Approximately one-third of the commissioners from urban counties stated they had not been directly involved in Extension programs and/or activities in contrast to only fifteen percent of those from rural counties. At the same time, twenty seven percent of the commissioners from urban counties had been involved in Extension programs and/or activities "a lot" in contrast to only eighteen percent of those from rural counties. Sixty seven percent of the commissioners from rural counties and forty four percent of those from urban counties stated they had been directly involved in Extension programs and/or activities "some." Over seventy percent of the commissioners from both rural and urban counties had been involved directly in Extension programs and/or activities.

As shown in Table 12, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to involvement in Extension programs and/or activities can be rejected at the .02 level of significance.

TABLE 12.--Classification of county commissioners by extent of direct involvement in Extension programs and/or activities

Involvement	Rural Frequency Distribution (number)	Rural Frequency Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency Distribution (number)	Urban Frequency Distribution (percent)
None	11	15.3	23	29.5
Some	48	66.7	34	43.6
A lot	13	18.0	21	26.9
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.281$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

Perceived Economic Value of Agriculture to the County

The perceived economic value of agriculture to the county is another factor that could logically be expected to relate directly to a county commissioner's perception of Extension programs. An almost identical percentage, approximately three percent, of the commissioners from both rural and urban counties perceived the economic value of agriculture to their county as "of little importance," leaving approximately ninety seven percent of both groups perceiving the value of agriculture to the county as "important" or "very important."

As shown in Table 13, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to perceived economic value of agriculture to the county cannot be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 13.--Classification of county commissioners by perceived economic value of agriculture to the county

Perceived Economic Value of Agriculture	Rural Frequency Distribution (number)	Rural Frequency Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency Distribution (number)	Urban Frequency Distribution (percent)
Of little importance	2	2.8	2	2.6
Important	16	22.2	29	37.2
Very important	54	75.0	47	60.2
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 3.060$ d.f. = 1 Not Significant at .05 level

Familiarity With the Cooperative Extension Service

Although previous data have reflected county commissioners' direct involvement in Extension programs, it is possible for county commissioners to be familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service, to varying degrees, without actually being directly involved in Extension's programs and/or activities. The majority of the commissioners from both rural and urban counties said they were "familiar" with Extension. A comparable percentage from both groups said they were "very familiar" with Extension. A higher percentage of commissioners from urban counties (twenty six percent) than those from rural counties (seventeen percent) said they were "not very familiar" with the Cooperative Extension Service.

As shown in Table 14, the null hypothesis of no difference between commissioners from rural and urban counties as related to familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service cannot be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 14.--Classification of county commissioners by familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service

Familiarity With Extension Service	Rural Frequency Distribution (number)	Rural Frequency Distribution (percent)	Urban Frequency Distribution (number)	Urban Frequency Distribution (percent)
Not very familiar	12	16.7	20	25.6
Familiar	46	63.9	40	51.3
Very familiar	14	19.4	18	23.1
Total	72	100.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 2.683$ d.f. = 2 Not Significant at .05 level

Summary

County commissioners from rural and urban counties showed very similar personal and social characteristics in some respects but were very different in others. There was no significant difference in tenure as a county commissioner, age, perceived economic value of agriculture to the county, and familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a significant difference, however, in main occupation, level of formal education, residential background, and extent of direct involvement in Extension programs and/or activities.

A look at the typical county commissioner from rural and urban counties helps put the above data in perspective. The typical county commissioner from the rural counties involved in this study was between 46 and 60 years of age with almost equal chances that he was serving his first, second, third, or more term as a county commissioner. There was a very strong probability that he was either a farmer or engaged in an agriculturally related business. In most instances he spent the most significant portion of his life on a farm or in a rural non-farm area and did not attend college. He felt very strongly that agriculture was very important to the economy of the county, had been directly involved in Extension programs and/or activities, though not a lot, and considered that he was familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service, though not "very familiar."

On the other hand, the typical county commissioner from the urban counties involved in this study was between 31 and 60 years of age with the probability very strong that he had served less than four years as a county commissioner. The probability was also very strong that he was not a farmer or engaged in an agriculturally related business. He was probably a businessman or engaged in a professional occupation. He spent the most significant portion of his life in a town with a population over 10,000 persons and attended college, probably four or more years. He felt that agriculture was very important to the economy of his county though not as strongly as a commissioner from a rural county. He had been directly involved in Extension programs "some," though not "a lot," and there was about one chance in three that he had not been involved at all. He perceived that he was familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service, though not "very familiar," and chances were about one in four that he was "not very familiar" with Extension.

Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Extension Programs as Perceived by County Commissioners

This section contains a rank order distribution of selected content and clientele of Extension programs as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties. The rank orders were based on total scores which were obtained by multiplying the number of respondents selecting a particular response on the questionnaire times the value assigned to the response. The rank order scores were used for comparison and for correlation using Spearman's rho for rank correlation (Siegel, 1956, pp. 202-213).

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: _There is no association between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work)._

Agricultural Subjects

Table 15 shows a rank order distribution of agricultural subjects as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. The commissioners from rural counties ranked "production of agricultural products" first while the urban commissioners ranked "proper use and conservation of natural resources" first. Both rural and urban commissioners were in agreement in ranking "marketing of agricultural products" second. Both groups were in reasonably close agreement in their perception of the importance of "land use planning." Urban commissioners ranked it third while rural commissioners ranked it fourth, giving third

TABLE 15.--Total score and rank order of agricultural subjects as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

Agricultural Subjects	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Production of agricultural products	341	1	342	4
Processing of agricultural products	310	6	321	8
Marketing of agricultural products	335	2	346	2
Farm business management	313	5	335	6
Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	256	10	320	9
Agricultural labor relations	297	9	302	10
Management of timberlands	299	8	326	7
Public affairs education	302	7	338	5
Land use planning	319	4	345	3
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	327	3	374	1

[1] N = 72
[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .842
t = 4.42   d.f. = 8   Significant at .01 level

place to "proper use and conservation of natural resources." Both groups were in almost complete agreement in placing "agricultural labor relations" and "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard" in ninth and tenth positions.

As shown in Table 15, the null hypothesis of no association between commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning agricultural subjects can be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Home Economics Subjects

Table 16 shows a rank order distribution of home economics subjects as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. Rural and urban commissioners simply reversed their first and second choice concerning the importance of home economics subjects. Rural commissioners gave "job preparation" first place while urban commissioners placed it second. On the other hand, urban commissioners placed "foods and nutrition" first while rural commissioners placed it second. Both groups were in agreement in placing "leadership development" third. Both groups were in almost complete agreement in placing "cultural arts" and "renovating furniture" in ninth and tenth positions.

As shown in Table 16, the null hypothesis of no association between commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning home economics subjects can be rejected at the .001 level of significance.

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects

Table 17 shows a rank order distribution of 4-H (youth work) subjects as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. Rural commissioners ranked "understanding public issues" first while urban commissioners ranked it third. On the other hand, urban commissioners

TABLE 16.--Total score and rank order of home economics subjects as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

Home Economics Subjects	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Clothing construction	278	7	276	8
Renovating furniture	242	9	239	10
Foods and nutrition	318	2	347	1
Cultural arts (understanding and appreciation for music, art, etc.)	230	10	265	9
Leadership development	314	3	330	3
Use of leisure time	257	8	293	6
Consumer education	299	5	326	4
Family life education	306	4	319	5
Job preparation (developing the basic skills to apply for and hold a job)	320	1	337	2
Efficient use of food stamps	288	6	286	7

[1] N = 72

[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .927
t = 6.98 d.f. = 8 Significant at .001 level

TABLE 17.--Total score and rank order of 4-H (youth work) subjects as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Homemaking skills (girls)	309	9	330	7
Agricultural skills (boys)	319	2	328	8.5
Community development	313	5.5	328	8.5
Understanding and improving the environment	312	7.5	351	1
Understanding public issues (public affairs)	322	1	340	3
Understanding economics and the American business system	312	7.5	333	6
Career exploration	296	10	320	10
Health education	316	3.5	350	2
Personal development	313	5.5	337	4
Food-nutrition	316	3.5	335	5

[1] N = 72

[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .322
t = .96   d.f. = 8   Not Significant at .05 level

ranked "understanding and improving the environment" first while rural commissioners placed it in a seventh place tie position. The widest diversity between the two groups had to do with the subjects "agricultural skills for boys" and "understanding and improving the environment." The closest agreement between the two groups involved the subject "career exploration" which both groups placed in tenth position.

As shown in Table 17, the null hypothesis of no association between the commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning 4-H (youth work) subjects cannot be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Agricultural Groups

Table 18 shows a rank order distribution of agricultural groups as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. There is very close agreement in the perception of commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning agricultural groups. In fact, the two commissioner groups were in complete agreement in ranking the first, second, third, and fourth place clientele groups. These groups are "average size family farmers," "small subsistence (low income) farmers," "agricultural commodity organizations," and "homeowners," respectively. The widest diversity in the perception of the two groups had to do with "agribusiness firms" which rural commissioners ranked fifth and urban commissioners ranked eighth.

As shown in Table 18, the null hypothesis of no association between commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning their perception of home economics clientele can be rejected at the .001 level of significance.

TABLE 18.--Total score and rank order of agricultural clientele groups as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

Agricultural Clientele Groups	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Large commercial farmers	275	7	295	5
Average size family farmers	314	1	326	1
Small subsistence (low income) farmers	313	2	325	2
Part-time farmers (operator works off farm more than 100 days per year)	255	8	277	9
Hobby farmers	194	10	236	10
Agribusiness firms (supply and/or service agriculture)	279	5	280	8
Agricultural commodity organizations (such as Cattleman's Association, etc.)	294	3	309	3
Homeowners	288	4	299	4
Local (domestic) farm laborers	277	6	291	6
Migrant farm laborers	221	9	283	7

[1] N = 72

[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .891
t = 5.56 d.f. = 8 Significant at .001 level

Home Economics Groups

Table 19 shows a rank order distribution of home economics groups as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. The two commissioner groups were in complete agreement in their choice of "farm homemakers" for top priority. Urban commissioners ranked "low income homemakers" second while rural commissioners ranked this group third. Rural commissioners ranked "senior citizens" second while urban commissioners placed this group in a tie position for third place. The widest diversity between the two groups was found in the urban commissioners' ranking of "homemakers from minority groups" in a third place tie position while rural commissioners ranked this group sixth. Both commissioner groups were in complete agreement in ranking "upper income homemakers" in tenth position.

As shown in Table 19, the null hypothesis of no association between commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning the relative importance of home economics clientele can be rejected at the .001 level of significance.

4-H (Youth Work) Groups

Table 20 shows a rank order distribution of 4-H (youth work) groups as perceived by commissioners from rural and urban counties. Commissioners from both rural and urban counties were in agreement that "farm youth" make up the most important group to be involved in Extension youth programs. They were also in agreement that second priority should be given to "all youth between 9 and 19 years of age." The two groups were almost in agreement with the third priority group being "low income youth." Commissioners from rural counties placed this group third

TABLE 19.--Total score and rank order of home economics clientele groups as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

Home Economics Clientele Groups	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Farm homemakers (live on the farm)	306	1	317	1
Rural non-farm homemakers (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	268	8	278	8
Small town and village homemakers	281	7	284	6.5
Urban and city homemakers	265	9	273	9
Low income homemakers	300	3	316	2
Middle income homemakers	288	5	284	6.5
Upper income homemakers	250	10	250	10
Senior citizens	302	2	301	3.5
Young married women (under 30 years of age)	297	4	295	5
Homemakers from minority groups	285	6	301	3.5

[1] N = 72
[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .921
t = 6.68 d.f. = 8 Significant at .001 level

TABLE 20.--Total score and rank order of 4-H (youth work) clientele groups as perceived by county commissioners from rural and urban counties

4-H (Youth Work) Clientele Groups	Rural Commissioners[1]		Urban Commissioners[2]	
	Total Score	Rank Order[3]	Total Score	Rank Order
Farm youth (live on the farm)	323	1	335	1
Rural non-farm youth (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	291	8	305	7
Small town and village youth	295	6	309	6
Urban and city youth	279	9	286	9
Youth from low income families	311	3	314	4
Youth from middle income families	303	4	298	8
Youth from upper income families	278	10	265	10
Youth from minority groups	294	7	310	5
All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	313	2	334	2
All youth between 7 and 19 years of age	297	5	327	3

[1] N = 72

[2] N = 78

[3] Rank Correlation-Spearman's Rho = .842
t = 4.42 d.f. = 8 Significant at .01 level

while commissioners from urban counties placed "low income youth" fourth, behind "all youth 7 to 19 years of age."

As shown in Table 20, the null hypothesis of no association between commissioners from rural and urban counties concerning their perception of the relative importance of youth clientele groups can be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Summary

With the exception of one area, content of Extension programs for youth, the null hypothesis of no association between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) can be rejected. This indicates that with the exception of youth program content the commissioners from both groups were in general agreement in their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs.

Association of Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners With Their Perception of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs

The purpose of this section is to show the association between eight personal and social characteristics (independent variables) of the rural and urban commissioners and their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs (dependent variable).

The independent variables are: (1) number of years as a county commissioner (tenure), (2) main occupation, (3) level of formal education, (4) age, (5) residential background, (6) involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, (7) perceived economic value of agriculture to the county, and (8) familiarity with the Extension Service.

Introduction

As previously indicated in Chapter II, perception is influenced considerably by the experience and environment of an individual. The eight independent variables in this study are considered by the researcher to relate to a commissioner's experience and environment and, therefore, to influence his perception of the content and clientele of Extension programs.

The association of the independent and dependent variables was analyzed using chi-square techniques. Chi-square values were computed from actual numerical frequencies. In the chi-square computations N for rural counties was 72, N for urban counties was 78, and N for rural and urban counties (total) was 150. When the expected frequencies were computed to be less than five, categories were collapsed. This was necessary in a number of cases as frequencies were disproportionately low in the "unimportant" and "not very important" categories. In some instances the frequencies were so distributed in the chi-square table that it was impossible to collapse categories and properly perform a chi-square analysis. Chi-square tables in which statistical significance was found are presented in Appendix C.

Program Content--Rural Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content. Program content was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (subjects) in each area.

Agricultural Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 21.

Tenure: There was a significant association between tenure and the agricultural subjects "management of timberlands" and "land use planning."

Eight and three-tenths percent of the commissioners with tenure less than four years rated management of timberlands very important while 91.7 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners with tenure between four and eight years, 48.1 percent rated

TABLE 21.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Production of agricultural products	Processing of agricultural products	Marketing of agricultural products	Farm business management	Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	Agricultural labor relations	Management of timberlands	Public affairs education	Land use planning	Proper use and conservation of natural resources
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	1	NS
Main occupation	0	NS	0	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	3	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	3	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	2
Involvement in programs	0	NS	0	NS	NS	NS	0	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	1	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	0	NS	0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

this subject very important and 51.9 percent rated it less than very important. Management of timberlands was rated very important by 42.9 percent of those commissioners with tenure over eight years with 57.1 percent of this group rating the subject less than very important.

Of the commissioners with less than four years tenure as a commissioner, 33.3 percent rated land use planning very important while 66.7 percent of this group rated this subject less than very important. In contrast, 74.1 percent of those commissioners with tenure between four and eight years rated land use planning very important and 25.9 percent rated it less than very important. Forty two and nine-tenths percent of the commissioners with tenure over eight years rated this subject very important with 57.1 percent rating it less than very important.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the agricultural subject "management of timberlands." This subject was rated very important by 7.1 percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was non-agricultural businessman which group also rated the subject less than very important at the 92.9 percent level. Forty three and two-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated management of timberlands very important while 56.8 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other," 28.6 percent rated the subject very important and 71.4 percent rated it less than very important.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten agricultural subjects.

Age: There was a significant association between age and the agricultural subjects "production of agricultural products," "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard," and "management of timberlands."

Fifty nine and one-tenth percent of the commissioners who were forty five years of age or under rated production of agricultural products very important while 40.9 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners who were over forty five years of age, 86.0 percent rated this subject very important and 14.0 percent rated it less than very important.

Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard was rated important and very important by 45.5 percent of the commissioners who were forty five years of age or under however 54.5 percent rated this subject less than important. Seventy four percent of those commissioners over forty five years of age rated this subject important and very important while 26.0 percent rated it less than important.

Of those commissioners forty five years of age and under, 13.6 percent rated management of timberlands very important and 86.4 percent rated it less than very important. This subject was rated very important by 42.0 percent of the commissioners over forty five with 58.0 percent rating it less than very important.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the agricultural subjects "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard" and "proper use and conservation of natural resources."

Sixty and three-tenths percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated lawns, plants, and trees in the yard important or very important while 39.7 percent rated it less than important. One hundred percent of the commissioners with "town" residential backgrounds rated this subject important or very important.

Of these commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds, 52.4 percent rated proper use and conservation of natural resources very important and 47.6 percent rated it less than very important. In contrast, one hundred percent of the commissioners with "town" backgrounds rated this subject very important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten agricultural subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the agricultural subjects "production of agricultural products" and "marketing of agricultural products."

Fifty percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important rated production of agricultural products very important and fifty percent rated it less than very important. On the other hand, 87.0 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be very important rated the production of agricultural products very important with 13.0 percent rating it less than very important.

Fifty percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to be of little importance to important rated marketing of agricultural products very important and fifty percent rated it less than very important. In contrast, 79.6 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as very important rated marketing of agricultural products very important while 24.4 percent of this group rated this subject less than very important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten agricultural subjects.

Home Economics Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 22.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten home economics subjects.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the home economics subject "leadership development." This subject was rated very important by 21.4 percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was non-agricultural businessman and 78.6 percent of whom rated the subject less than very important. Thirty six and four-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated leadership development very important and 63.6 percent rated it less than very important. Of the commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other," 71.4 percent rated the subject very important and 28.6 percent rated it less than very important.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten home economics subjects.

TABLE 22.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Clothing construction	Renovating furniture	Foods and nutrition	Cultural arts	Leadership development	Use of leisure time	Consumer education	Family life education	Job preparation	Efficient use of food stamps
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	0	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	0	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS
Involvement in programs	0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Age: There was a significant association between age and the home economics subject "cultural arts." Of the commissioners forty five years of age and under, 22.7 percent rated cultural arts important or very important, 63.7 percent rated it neutral and 13.6 percent rated it unimportant or not very important. In contrast, 50.0 percent of the commissioners over forty five years of age rated this subject important or very important, 24.0 percent rated it neutral and 26.0 percent rated it unimportant or not very important.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the subject "job preparation." Twenty two and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners with a farm or rural non-farm background rated job preparation very important while 58.7 percent rated it less than very important. In contrast, 88.9 percent of the commissioners with a "town" background rated this subject very important and 11.1 percent rated it less than very important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten home economics subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was no significant association between economic value of agriculture to the county and the ten home economics subjects.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten home economics subjects.

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 23.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding economics and the American business system." Twenty one and four-tenths percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated this subject very important while 78.6 percent rated it less than very important. Thirty eight and six-tenths percent of the farmers or agricultural related businessmen rated the subject very important and 61.4 percent rated it less than very important. Seventy one and four-tenths percent of the professional and "other" commissioners rated this subject very important while 28.6 percent rated it less than very important.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was no significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

TABLE 23.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Homemaking skills for girls	Agricultural skills for boys	Community development	Understanding and improving the environment	Understanding public issues	Understanding economics, American business system	Career exploration	Health education	Personal development	Food-nutrition
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	0	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that fourteen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 21, 22, and 23.

Program Content--Urban Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content. Program content was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (subjects) in each area.

Agricultural Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties is shown in Table 24.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten agricultural subjects.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten agricultural subjects.

TABLE 24.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Production of agricultural products	Processing of agricultural products	Marketing of agricultural products	Farm business management	Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	Agricultural labor relations	Management of timberlands	Public affairs education	Land use planning	Proper use and conservation of natural resources
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0
Level of education	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0
Economic value of agriculture	1	1	1	1	NS	1	NS	3	NS	1
Familiarity with Extension	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Level of Education: There was a significant association between level of formal education and the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products." Of those commissioners whose formal education was high school or less, 82.4 percent rated marketing of agricultural products very important while 17.6 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners who attended college, 50.8 percent rated this subject very important while 49.2 percent rated it less than very important.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten agricultural subjects.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten agricultural subjects.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten agricultural subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between the perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the agricultural subjects "production of agricultural products," "processing of agricultural products," "marketing of agricultural products," "farm business management," "agricultural labor relations," "public affairs education," and "proper use and conservation of natural resources."

Of those commissioners perceiving the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 22.5 percent rated production of agricultural products very important, 58.1 percent rated this subject important, and 19.4 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners perceiving the economic value of agriculture to the county as very important, 74.4 percent rated production of agricultural products as very important, 21.3 percent rated this subject important, and 4.3 percent rated it less than important.

Within the group of commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 16.1 percent rated processing of agricultural products very important, 48.4 percent rated this subject important while 35.5 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture as very important, 59.6 percent rated processing of agricultural products very important, 29.8 percent rated it important, and 10.6 percent rated this subject less than important.

Twenty five and eight-tenths percent of the commissioners perceiving the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important rated marketing of agricultural products very important while 51.6 percent rated it important. Twenty two and six-tenths percent rated this subject less than important. Seventy eight and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture as very important rated marketing of agricultural products very important, 19.2 percent rated this subject important while 2.1 percent rated it less than important.

With regard to farm business management, 12.9 percent of the commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important rated it very important, 74.2 percent rated it important, and 12.9 percent rated it less than important. Sixty one and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture as very important rated farm business management very important, 29.8 percent rated it important, and 8.5 percent rated it less than important.

Twelve and nine-tenths percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important rated agricultural labor relations very important, 38.7 percent rated it important while 48.4 percent rated this subject less than important. On the other hand, 46.8 percent of the commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture as very important rated agricultural labor relations very important, 31.9 percent rated it important, and 21.2 percent rated it less than important.

Thirty five and one-half percent of the commissioners with the lower evaluation of the economic value of agriculture to the county rated public affairs education very important, 45.2 percent rated it important while 19.3 percent rated it less than important. In contrast, 59.5 percent of the commissioners with the higher evaluation of agriculture rated this subject very important, 36.2 percent rated it important, and 4.3 percent rated it less than important.

Of those commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture as of little importance to important, 64.5 percent rated proper use and conservation of natural resources very important while 35.5 percent rated it less than very important. On the other hand, 91.5 percent of the commissioners with the higher evaluation of agriculture rated this subject very important with 8.5 percent rating it less than very important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products." Of those commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service, 25.0

percent rated production of agricultural products very important while 75.0 percent rated it less than very important. Sixty percent of the commissioners who were familiar with the Extension Service rated this subject very important and 40.0 percent rated it less than very important. Seventy two and two-tenths percent of the commissioners who were very familiar with the Extension Service rated production of agricultural products very important while 27.8 percent rated it less than very important.

Home Economics Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties is shown in Table 25.

Tenure: There was a significant association between tenure and the home economics subject "clothing construction." Of those commissioners whose tenure was less than four years, 51.2 percent rated clothing construction important or very important while 48.8 percent rated it as less than important. Fifty two and four-tenths percent of the commissioners with tenure between four and eight years rated this subject important or very important and 47.6 percent rated it less than important. Eighty seven and one-half percent of the commissioners who had served as commissioner over eight years rated clothing construction important or very important while 12.5 percent rated it less than important.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten home economics subjects.

Level of Education: There was no significant association

TABLE 25.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Clothing construction	Renovating furniture	Foods and nutrition	Cultural arts	Leadership development	Use of leisure time	Consumer education	Family life education	Job preparation	Efficient use of food stamps
Tenure	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS	2	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

between level of education and the ten home economics subjects.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten home economics subjects.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten home economics subjects.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and the ten home economics subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the subjects "leadership development" and "job preparation."

Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 19.4 percent rated leadership development very important, 54.8 percent rated it important, and 25.8 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as very important, 59.6 percent rated leadership development very important, 34.0 percent rated it important, and 6.4 percent rated it less than important.

Concerning job preparation, 29.0 percent of the commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture as of little importance to important rated this subject very important, 51.6 percent rated it important while 19.4 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived a higher economic value of agriculture to the county, 61.7 percent rated job preparation very important, 31.9 percent rated it important, and 6.4 percent rated this subject less than important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant

TABLE 26.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Homemaking skills for girls	Agricultural skills for boys	Community development	Understanding and improving the environment	Understanding public issues	Understanding economics, American business system	Career exploration	Health education	Personal development	Food-nutrition
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	1	1	3	NS	NS	3	2	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten home economics subjects.

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties is shown in Table 26.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the subjects "community development," "understanding and improving the environment," "understanding public issues," "health education," and "personal development."

Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 19.4 percent rated community development very important, 61.2 percent rated it important, and 19.4 percent rated it less than important. In the group of commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county was very important, 46.8 percent rated community development very important, 51.1 percent important, and 2.1 percent less than important.

Concerning the subject "understanding and improving the environment," 35.5 percent of the commissioners with the lower evaluation of agriculture rated it very important while 64.5 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners with the higher evaluation of agriculture, 70.2 percent rated this subject very important and 29.8 percent rated it less than very important.

Thirty two and three-tenths percent of the commissioners whose perception of the value of agriculture was of little importance to important rated public issues very important while 67.7 percent rated it less than very important. On the other hand, 61.7 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture as very important rated this subject very important and 38.3 percent rated it less than very important.

With regard to the subject "health education," 38.7 percent of the commissioners with the lower evaluation of agriculture rated it very important while 61.3 percent rated it less than very important. Sixty six percent of the commissioners with the higher evaluation of agriculture rated the subject very important and 34.0 percent rated it less than very important.

Twenty nine percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important rated personal development as very important, 51.6 percent rated it important, and 19.4 percent rated it less than important. Of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important, 59.6 percent rated personal development very important, 36.2 percent rated it important, and 4.3 percent rated this subject less than important.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that seventeen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 24, 25, and 26.

Program Content--Rural and Urban (Total) Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content. Program content was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (subjects) in each area.

Agricultural Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Production of agricultural products	Processing of agricultural products	Marketing of agricultural products	Farm business management	Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	Agricultural labor relations	Management of timberlands	Public affairs education	Land use planning	Proper use and conservation of natural resources
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	3	NS	3	2	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	1
Level of education	1	3	2	3	NS	1	NS	NS	NS	3
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	3	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	1
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	1	1	1	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten agricultural subjects.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the following subjects: (1) production of agricultural products, (2) marketing of agricultural products, (3) farm business management, (4) agricultural labor relations, and (5) proper use and conservation of natural resources.

Fifty five and eight-tenths percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated production of agricultural products very important in contrast to 44.2 percent who rated this subject less than very important. Seventy eight and two-tenths percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was farming or agricultural related business rated this subject very important while 21.8 percent rated it less than very important. Of those commissioners who held professional and "other" positions, 60.5 percent rated the subject very important while 39.5 percent rated it less than very important.

Of those commissioners engaged in non-agricultural business, 53.8 percent rated marketing of agricultural products very important and 46.2 percent rated it less than very important. Seventy six and four-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated the subject very important while 23.6 percent rated it less than very important. Of the commissioners in professional and "other" positions, 62.8 percent rated this subject very important while 37.2 percent rated it less than very important.

Thirty two and seven-tenths percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated the subject "farm business management" very important, 51.9 percent rated it important, and 15.4 percent rated it less than important. Of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen, 60.0 percent rated this subject very important, 30.9 percent important, and 9.1 percent less than important. Professional and "other" commissioners rated farm business management very important at the 41.9 percent level with 55.8 percent rating it important and 2.3 percent rating it less than important.

With regard to the subject "agricultural labor relations," 69.2 percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated it important or very important while 30.8 percent rated it less than important. Eighty one and eight-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated this subject important or very important and 18.2 percent rated it less than important. Of the professional and "other" commissioners, 72.1 percent rated the subject important or very important while 27.9 percent rated it less than important.

Eighty and eight-tenths percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated proper use and conservation of natural resources very important while 19.2 percent rated it less than very important. Fifty two and seven-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural businessmen rated it very important with 47.3 percent rating it less than important. Of those commissioners with professional and "other" positions, 79.1 percent rated the subject very important while 20.9 percent rated it less than very important.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between the level of formal education and the following agricultural subjects: (1) production of agricultural products, (2) processing of agricultural products, (3) marketing of agricultural products, (4) farm business management, (5) agricultural labor relations, and (6) proper use and conservation of natural resources.

One hundred percent of the commissioners with a formal educational level of high school or less rated production of agricultural products important or very important. On the other hand, 87.8 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this subject important or very important while 12.2 percent rated it less than important.

Ninety four and one-tenth percent of the high school or less commissioners rated processing of agricultural products important or very important while 5.9 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners attending college, 79.3 percent rated this subject important or very important with 20.7 percent rating it less than important.

Ninety seven and one-tenth percent of the commissioners with high school or less levels of education rated marketing of agricultural products important or very important while 2.9 percent rated it less than important. On the other hand, 87.8 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this subject important or very important while 12.2 percent rated it less than important.

Of those commissioners with high school or less levels of education, 95.6 percent rated farm business management important or very important while 4.4 percent rated it less than important. Eighty six and six-tenths percent of those attending college rated this subject important or very important with 13.4 percent rating it less than important.

With regard to the subject "agricultural labor relations," 86.8 percent of the commissioners who completed high school or less rated it important or very important while 13.2 percent rated it less than important. In contrast, 64.7 percent of those attending college rated this subject important or very important with 35.3 percent rating it less than important.

Sixty and three-tenths percent of the commissioners completing high school or less rated proper use and conservation of natural resources very important while 39.7 percent rated it less than very important. On the other hand, 78.1 percent of those attending college rated this subject very important with 21.9 percent rating it less than very important.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the following agricultural subjects: (1) processing of agricultural products, (2) lawns, plants, and trees in the yard, and (3) proper use and conservation of natural resources.

Ninety two and one-half percent of those commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated processing of agricultural products important or very important while 7.5 percent rated it less than important. Of those whose residential background was "town," 78.5 percent rated this subject important or very important with 21.5 percent rating it less than important.

With regard to the subject "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard," 65.0 percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated it important or very important while thirty five percent rated it less than important. In contrast, 88.6 percent of the commissioners with town backgrounds rated this subject important or very important with 11.4 percent rating it less than important.

The subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources" was rated very important by 58.7 percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds while 41.3 percent of this group rated it less than very important. This subject was rated very important by 82.9 percent of the commissioners with town backgrounds with 17.1 percent of those commissioners rating it less than very important.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the following subjects: (1) production of agricultural products, (2) processing of agricultural products, (3) marketing of agricultural products, and (4) farm business management.

Of those commissioners perceiving the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 83.7 percent rated production of agricultural products important or very important while 16.3 percent rated it less than important. Ninety eight and one-tenth percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture as very important rated this subject important or very important while 1.9 percent rated it less than important.

Processing of agricultural products was rated important or very important by 73.5 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to be of little importance to important. Twenty six and five-tenths percent of this group rated this subject less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important, 92.1 percent rated processing of agricultural products important or very important while 7.9 percent rated it less than important.

Of those commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture was of little importance to important, 81.6 percent rated marketing of agricultural products important or very important with 18.4 percent rating it less than important. Of those commissioners whose perception of the value of agriculture was very important, 97.1 percent rated this subject important or very important with 2.9 percent rating it less than important.

Farm business management was rated important or very important by 87.8 percent of the commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county was of little importance to important. This subject was rated less than important by 12.2 percent of this group. On the other hand, 92.1 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated this subject important or very important with 7.9 percent rating it less than important.

Home Economics Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is shown in Table 28.

Tenure: There was a significant association between tenure and the home economics subject "clothing construction." Fifty six and nine-tenths percent of the commissioners with a tenure of less than four years rated clothing construction important or very important while 43.1 percent of this group rated this subject less than important. Of those commissioners who had served as commissioners between four and eight years, 70.8 percent rated the subject important or very important with 29.2 percent rating it less than important. Clothing construction was rated important or very important by 83.8 percent of the commissioners with tenure over eight years while 16.2 percent of this group rated the

TABLE 28.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Clothing construction	Renovating furniture	Foods and nutrition	Cultural arts	Leadership development	Use of leisure time	Consumer education	Family life education	Job preparation	Efficient use of food stamps
Tenure	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	2
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	2	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	2
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

subject less than important.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the subjects "renovating furniture" and "efficient use of food stamps."

Renovating furniture was rated important or very important by 28.9 percent of the commissioners who were non-agricultural businessmen. Within this same group, 71.1 percent rated this subject less than important. Sixty percent of the farmers or agricultural related businessmen rated the subject important or very important with forty percent rating it less than important. Forty one and eight-tenths percent of the professional and "other" commissioners rated renovating furniture important or very important with 23.3 percent rating it less than important.

Of those commissioners who were non-agricultural businessmen, 55.8 percent rated efficient use of food stamps important or very important while 44.2 percent rated the subject less than important. Eighty one and eight-tenths percent of those who were farmers or agricultural related businessmen rated the subject important or very important while 18.2 percent of this group rated it less than important. Of those commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other," 67.4 percent rated the subject important or very important with 32.6 percent rating it less than important.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between level of formal education and efficient use of food stamps. Commissioners who completed high school or less rated efficient use of food stamps important or very important at the 80.9 percent level, with 19.1 percent of this group rating the subject less than important. Of those commissioners who attended college, 58.5 percent rated efficient use of food stamps important or very important while 41.5 percent of this group rated this subject less than important.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten home economics subjects.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the following home economics subjects: (1) renovating furniture, (2) consumer education, and (3) efficient use of food stamps.

Fifty five percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated the subject "renovating furniture" important or very important while 45.0 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners whose background was "town," 31.4 percent rated this subject important or very important with 68.6 percent rating it less than important.

With regard to the subject "consumer education," 93.7 percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated it important or very important while 6.3 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners with town backgrounds, 84.3 percent rated this subject important or very important with 15.7 percent rating it less than important.

Seventy eight and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners with farm or rural backgrounds rated efficient use of food stamps important or very important while 21.3 percent rated it less than important. On the other hand, 57.1 percent of those with a town background rated this subject important or very important with 42.9 percent rating it less than important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten home economics subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the home economics subject "leadership development." Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as being of little importance to important, 83.7 percent rated leadership development important or very important and 16.3 percent rated it less than important. Ninety five percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture as being very important rated this subject important or very important with five percent rating it less than important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the home economics subject "consumer education." Of those commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service, 84.4 percent rated consumer education important or very important and 15.6 percent rated it less than important. Of the commissioners who were familiar with Extension, 87.2 percent rated this subject important or very important while 12.8 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners who were very familiar with Extension, one hundred percent rated consumer education important or very important.

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is shown in Table 29.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between level of formal education and the following subjects: (1) agricultural skills for boys, (2) understanding public issues, and (3) food-nutrition.

Of those commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less, 98.5 percent rated agricultural skills for boys important or very important while 1.5 percent rated this subject less than important. In contrast, 89.1 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated agricultural skills for boys important or very important with 10.9 percent of this group rating it less than important.

With regard to the subject "understanding public issues," 97.1 percent of the commissioners completing high school or less rated it important or very important while 2.9 percent rated it less than important. Ninety and two-tenths percent of the commissioners attending college rated this subject important or very important while 9.8 percent rated it less than important.

The subject "food-nutrition" was rated important or very important by 98.5 percent of the commissioners at the high school or less level while 1.5 percent rated it less than important. In contrast, 86.6 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this subject important or very important with 13.4 percent of this group rating it less than important.

TABLE 29.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program content as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Homemaking skills for girls	Agricultural skills for boys	Community development	Understanding and improving the environment	Understanding public issues	Understanding economics, American business system	Career exploration	Health education	Personal development	Food-nutrition
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	3	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	2	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	3	NS	2	NS	NS	1	1	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the 4-H (youth work) subject "agricultural skills for boys." Ninety seven and one-half percent of the commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated this subject important or very important. Two and one-half percent rated it less than important. In contrast, 88.6 percent of the commissioners with "town" backgrounds rated this subject important or very important while 11.4 percent rated it less than important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between economic value of agriculture to the county and the following subjects: (1) community development, (2) understanding public issues, (3) health education, and (4) personal development.

Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important, 87.8 percent rated community development important or very important while 12.2 percent of them rated it less than important. In contrast, 96.1 percent of the commissioners who perceived agriculture to be very important to the county rated this subject important or very important with 3.9 percent rating it less than important.

The subject "understanding public issues" was rated important or very important by 87.7 percent of the commissioners who perceived agriculture to be of little importance to important. Twelve and three-tenths percent of this group rated this subject less than important. Ninety six percent of the commissioners who perceived agriculture to be very important rated understanding public issues important or very important with the other four percent rating it less than important.

Health education was rated important or very important by 87.8 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important while 12.2 percent of the group rated this subject less than important. In contrast, 98.0 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated health education important or very important, leaving two percent that rated it less than important.

Of those commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture as of little importance to important, 81.6 percent rated personal development important or very important while 18.4 percent rated it less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be very important, 96.1 percent rated personal development important or very important with 3.9 percent rating it less than important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten 4-H (youth work) subjects.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that 35 of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 27, 28, and 29.

Program Clientele--Rural Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele. Program clientele was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (clientele groups) in each area.

Agricultural Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 30.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the agricultural clientele group "part-time farmers." Of those commissioners whose main occupation was non-agricultural businessman, 57.1 percent rated part-time farmers important or very important and 43.9 percent rated this group less than important. Seventy five percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated part-time farmers important or very important with 25.0 percent rating them less than important. Of the commissioners who were engaged in a professional business and those engaged in "other" main occupations, 35.7 percent rated part-time farmers important or very important and 64.3 percent rated them less than important.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between

TABLE 30.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Large commercial farmers	Average size family farmers	Small subsistence farmers	Part-time farmers	Hobby farmers	Agribusiness firms	Agricultural commodity organizations	Homeowners	Local (domestic) farm laborers	Migrant farm laborers
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	0	NS	NS	3	0	0	0	0	0	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	3
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	2
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	0	NS	NS	NS	NS	0	0	0	0	0
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Familiarity with Extension	0	NS	NS	NS	0	0	0	0	0	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

level of formal education and the agricultural clientele group "part-time farmers," "local (domestic) farm laborers," and "migrant farm laborers."

Seventy two and one-half percent of those commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less rated part-time farmers important or very important while 27.5 percent rated this group less than important. Of those commissioners who attended college 42.9 percent rated part-time farmers important or very important and 57.1 percent rated this group less than important.

Local (domestic) farm laborers were rated important or very important by 87.7 percent of the commissioners completing high school or less while 15.7 percent of this group rated the laborers less than important. Thirty eight and one-tenth percent of those commissioners attending college rated this agricultural clientele group important or very important and 61.9 percent rated them less than important.

Thirty seven and three-tenths percent of the commissioners completing high school or less rated migrant farm laborers important or very important, 33.3 percent rated this clientele group neutral, and 29.4 percent rated them unimportant or not very important. On the other hand, 23.8 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated migrant farm laborers important or very important, 66.7 percent rated them neutral, and 9.5 percent rated them unimportant or not very important.

Age: There was a significant association between age and the agricultural clientele groups "homeowners" and "migrant farm laborers."

Four and one-half percent of the commissioners who were forty five years of age or under rated homeowners very important, 54.6 percent rated them important, and 40.9 percent rated this group less than important. In contrast, 34.0 percent of the commissioners who were over forty five years of age rated homeowners very important, 54.0 percent rated them important, and 12.0 percent rated them less than important.

Of those commissioners who were forty five years of age and under, 22.7 percent rated migrant farm laborers important or very important and 77.3 percent rated this group less than important. Of those over forty five, 38.0 percent rated the laborers important or very important and 62.0 percent rated them less than important.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the agricultural clientele group "migrant farm laborers." Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be of little importance to important, 55.6 percent rated migrant farm laborers as important or very important and 44.4 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important, 25.9 percent rated mifarm laborers important or very important while 74.1 percent rated them less than important.

Home Economics Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 31.

Tenure: There was a significant association between tenure and the home economics clientele group "homemakers from minority groups." Of those commissioners with tenure less than four years, 87.5 percent rated homemakers from minority groups important or very important with 12.5 percent rating this group less than important. This clientele group was rated important or very important by 59.2 percent of those commissioners who had served as commissioners between four and eight years while 40.8 percent of this group rated the minority homemakers less than important. Of those commissioners who had served over eight years, 90.5 percent rated this clientele group important or very important and 9.5 percent rated them less than important.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was a significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities

TABLE 31.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Farm homemakers	Rural non-farm homemakers	Small town and village homemakers	Urban and city homemakers	Low income homemakers	Middle income homemakers	Upper income homemakers	Senior citizens	Young married women	Homemakers from minority groups
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Main occupation	NS	NS	0	NS	0	0	NS	NS	0	0
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	0	0	0	NS	0	0	1	NS	0	0
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	0	NS	0	0	NS	NS	0	0

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

and the home economics clientele group "upper income homemakers." Of those commissioners who had not been involved in Extension programs or activities at all, 54.5 percent rated upper income homemakers important or very important and 45.5 percent rated them less than important. Commissioners who had been involved in Extension programs or activities "some" rated the upper income homemakers important or very important at 66.7 percent while 33.3 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who had been involved "a lot," 15.4 percent rated upper income homemakers important or very important while 84.6 percent rated them less than important.

4-H (Youth Work) Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 32.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Age: There was a significant association between age and the 4-H (youth work) clientele groups "urban and city youth" and "youth from upper income families."

Of those commissioners forty five years of age and under, 13.6

TABLE 32.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Farm youth	Rural non-farm youth	Small town and village youth	Urban and city youth	Youth from low income families	Youth from middle income families	Youth from upper income families	Youth from minority groups	All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	All youth between 7 and 19 years of age
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	0	0	0	NS	0	0	0	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	0	0	0	NS	0	0	0	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	0	0	0	NS	0	0	0	NS	0

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

percent rated urban and city youth very important, 36.4 percent rated them important, and 50.0 percent rated them less than important. In contrast, 24.0 percent of the commissioners over forty five rated the urban and city youth very important, 58.0 percent rated them important, and 18.0 percent rated them less than important.

Thirteen and six-tenths percent of the commissioners forty five and under rated youth from upper income families very important, 31.8 percent rated them important, and 54.6 percent rated this group less than important. Of the "over forty five" year age group of commissioners, 26.0 percent rated the upper income youth very important, 58.0 percent rated them important, and 16.0 percent rated them less than important.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was no significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was no significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that eleven of the

240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 30, 31, and 32.

Program Clientele--Urban Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: _There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele_. Program clientele was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (clientele groups) in each area.

Agricultural Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties is shown in Table 33.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten agricultural clientele

TABLE 33.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Large commercial farmers	Average size family farmers	Small subsistence farmers	Part-time farmers	Hobby farmers	Agribusiness firms	Agricultural commodity organizations	Homeowners	Local (domestic) farm laborers	Migrant farm laborers
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	3	3	3	3
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	2	NS	NS	NS	1	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was a significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the agricultural clientele group "agricultural commodity organizations." Of those commissioners whose involvement in Extension programs was categorized as "none," 13.1 percent rated agricultural commodity organizations very important while 86.9 percent rated them less than important. Of those whose involvement was categorized as "some," 14.7 percent rated this clientele group very important while 85.3 percent rated them less than very important. Of those whose involvement was categorized "a lot," 47.6 percent rated agricultural commodity organizations very important and 52.4 percent rated them less than very important.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the following agricultural clientele groups: (1) large commercial farmers, (2) agribusiness firms, (3) agricultural commodity organizations, (4) homeowners, (5) local (domestic) farm laborers, and (6) migrant farm laborers.

Large commercial farmers were rated very important by 12.9 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as of little importance to important. Thirty five and one-half percent of the commissioners rated this clientele group important, 25.8 percent neutral, and 25.8 percent unimportant or not very important. Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as very important, 29.8 percent rated large commercial farmers very important, 55.3 percent important, 8.5 percent neutral, and 6.4 percent unimportant or not very important.

Commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture to the county to be of little importance to important rated agribusiness firms very important at the 6.4 percent level, with 48.4 percent of this commissioner group rating agribusiness firms important, 12.9 percent neutral, and 32.3 percent unimportant or not very important. On the other hand, 17.0 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture as very important rated this clientele group very important, 57.5 percent rated them important, 19.1 percent rated them neutral, and 6.4 percent rated them unimportant or not very important.

Twelve and nine-tenths percent of the commissioners with the lower perception of the value of agriculture to the county rated agricultural commodity organizations very important, 58.1 percent important, and 29.0 percent less than important. Of those commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture to be very important, 29.8 percent rated agricultural commodity organizations very important, 61.7 percent important, and 8.5 percent less than important.

Six and one-half percent of the commissioners whose perception of agriculture was of little importance to important rated homeowners very important, 67.7 percent rated them important, and 25.8 percent rated them unimportant or not very important. On the other hand, 27.7 percent of those whose perception of the value of agriculture was very important rated homeowners very important while 44.6 percent rated them important and 27.7 percent rated them unimportant or not very important.

Three and two-tenths percent of the commissioners perceiving the value of agriculture to be of little importance to important rated local (domestic) farm laborers very important as a clientele group, 61.3

percent rated them important, 16.1 percent rated them neutral, and 19.4 percent rated them unimportant or not very important. In contrast, 25.5 percent of the commissioners whose perception of the value of agriculture was very important rated this clientele group very important, 53.2 percent rated them important, 14.9 percent neutral, and 6.4 percent unimportant or not very important.

Migrant farm laborers were rated very important by 9.7 percent of the commissioners with the lower perception of the value of agriculture while 38.7 percent of this group rated migrant laborers important, 25.8 percent rated them neutral, and 25.8 percent rated them unimportant or not very important. In contrast, 27.7 percent of the commissioners with the higher perception of the value of agriculture rated migrant laborers very important, 44.6 percent rated them important, 21.3 percent neutral, and 6.4 percent unimportant or not very important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the agricultural clientele groups "small subsistence farmers" and "agricultural commodity organizations."

Sixty percent of the commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service rated small subsistence farmers very important while 40.0 percent rated them less than very important. Of those commissioners who were familiar with the Extension Service, 22.5 percent rated small subsistence farmers very important and 77.5 percent rated them less than very important. Forty four and four-tenths percent of the commissioners who were very familiar with the Extension Service rated this clientele group very important while 55.6 percent rated them less than very important.

Fifteen percent of the commissioners who were familiar with Extension rated agricultural commodity organizations very important with 85.0 percent rating them less than very important. Commissioners who were familiar with Extension placed the same ratings on this clientele group while commissioners who were very familiar with Extension rated agricultural commodity organizations equally very important and less than very important.

Home Economics Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties is shown in Table 34.

Tenure: There was a significant association between tenure and the home economics clientele group "low income homemakers." Of those commissioners with tenure less than four years, 26.8 percent rated low income homemakers very important while 73.2 percent rated them less than very important. Fourteen and three-tenths percent of the commissioners with tenure between four and eight years rated this clientele group very important and 85.7 percent rated them less than very important. In contrast, 56.2 percent of the commissioners with tenure over eight years rated low income homemakers very important and 43.8 percent rated them less than very important.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten home economics clientele groups.

TABLE 34.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Farm homemakers	Rural non-farm homemakers	Small town and village homemakers	Urban and city homemakers	Low income homemakers	Middle income homemakers	Upper income homemakers	Senior citizens	Young married women	Homemakers from minority groups
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	NS	0	NS	0
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .03 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was no significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the home economics clientele group "urban and city homemakers." Within the group of commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service 40.0 percent of the commissioners rated urban and city homemakers important or very important while 60.0 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who were familiar with Extension, 70.0 percent rated this clientele group important or very important and 30.0 percent rated them less than important. Commissioners who were very familiar with Extension responded with 44.4 percent rating urban and city homemakers important or very important and 55.6 percent rating them less than important.

4-H (Youth Work) Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) clientele as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties is shown in Table 35.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was no significant association between main occupation and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Level of Education: There was no significant association between level of formal education and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was a significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the following 4-H (youth work) clientele groups: (1) farm youth, (2) rural non-farm youth, (3) all youth between nine and nineteen years of age, and (4) all youth between seven and nineteen years of age.

Forty three and one-half percent of the commissioners who had not been involved in Extension programs rated farm youth very important and 56.5 percent rated them less than very important. Twenty six and one-half percent of those who had been involved "some" rated this group very important while 73.5 percent rated them less than very important. Of those commissioners who had been involved in Extension programs and/or activities "a lot," 61.9 percent rated farm youth very important with 38.1 percent rating them less than very important.

With regard to rural non-farm youth, 60.9 percent of the

TABLE 35.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Farm youth	Rural non-farm youth	Small town and village youth	Urban and city youth	Youth from low income families	Youth from middle income families	Youth from upper income families	Youth from minority groups	All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	All youth between 7 and 19 years of age
Tenure	NS	0	0	NS	0	0	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	3	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	3
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Familiarity with Extension	NS	3	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

commissioners who had not been involved in Extension programs rated them important or very important with 39.1 percent rating them less than important. Of those commissioners who had been involved "some," 73.5 percent rated this group important or very important and 26.5 percent rated them less than important. Of that group of commissioners that had been involved "a lot," 85.7 percent rated rural non-farm youth important or very important while 14.3 percent rated them less than important.

Twenty one and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners who had not been involved in Extension programs rated all youth between nine and nineteen years of age very important and 78.3 percent rated them less than very important. Forty four and one-tenth percent of the commissioners who had been involved "some" rated this group very important while 55.9 percent rated them less than very important. Of that group of commissioners who had been involved "a lot," 61.9 percent rated this clientele group very important and 38.1 percent rated them less than very important.

All youth between seven and nineteen years of age were rated very important by 17.4 percent of the commissioners who had not been involved in Extension programs while 82.6 percent rated them less than very important. Thirty eight and two-tenths percent of those commissioners who had been involved "some" rated youth between seven and nineteen years of age very important and 61.8 percent rated them less than very important. Of those commissioners who were involved "a lot," 57.1 percent rated this clientele group very important and 42.9 percent rated them less than very important.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the 4-H (youth work) clientele group "all youth between seven and nineteen years of age." Of those commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be of little importance to important, 19.4 percent rated this clientele group very important, 64.5 percent important, and 16.1 percent less than important. In contrast, 48.9 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated this group very important, 40.4 percent important, and 10.7 percent less than important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the clientele groups "rural non-farm youth," "small town and village youth," and "all youth between nine and nineteen years of age."

Commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service were equally divided, 50.0 percent each, in their rating of rural non-farm youth as important or very important and less than important. Eighty percent of the commissioners who were familiar with Extension rated this group important or very important and 20.0 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who were very familiar with Extension, 83.3 percent rated rural non-farm youth important or very important and 16.7 percent rated them less than important.

Fifty five percent of the commissioners who were not very familiar with Extension rated small town and village youth important or very important while 45.0 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who were familiar with Extension, 82.5 percent rated this group important or very important and 17.5 percent rated them less than important. Eighty three and three-tenths percent of the commissioners who were very familiar with Extension rated the small town and village youth important or very important while 16.7 percent rated them less than important.

Twenty percent of the commissioners who were not very familiar with Extension rated all youth between nine and nineteen years of age very important and 80.0 percent rated them less than very important. Forty five percent of those who were familiar with Extension rated this group very important with 55.0 percent rating it less than very important. Sixty one and one-tenth percent of the commissioners who were very familiar with Extension rated this clientele group very important while 38.9 percent rated them less than very important.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that nineteen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 33, 34, and 35.

Program Clientele--Rural and Urban (Total) Counties

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele. Program clientele was divided into three areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work) with ten elements (clientele groups) in each area.

Agricultural Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is shown in Table 36.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the following agricultural clientele groups: (1) large commercial farmers, (2) average size family farmers, (3) small subsistence farmers, and (4) local (domestic) farm laborers.

Nine and six-tenths percent of the commissioners who were non-agricultural businessmen rated large commercial farmers very important, 61.5 percent rated them important, and 28.9 percent rated this clientele group less than important. Of those commissioners who were farmers or agricultural related businessmen, 21.8 percent rated large commercial farmers very important, 58.2 percent rated them important, and 20.0 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who were engaged in professional or "other" occupations, 34.8 percent rated large commercial farmers very important, 37.2 percent important, and 28.0 percent less than important.

Thirty and seven-tenths percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated average size family farmers very important, 46.2 percent rated them important, while 23.1 percent rated this group less than important. Fifty two and seven-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated this clientele group very important, TABLE 36.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable agricultural program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Large commercial farmers	Average size family farmers	Small subsistence farmers	Part-time farmers	Hobby farmers	Agribusiness firms	Agricultural commodity organizations	Homeowners	Local (domestic) farm laborers	Migrant farm laborers
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	3	1	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	1	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS	2	NS	3	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	1	1	NS	NS	NS	1	3	1	NS	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

45.5 percent important, and 1.8 percent less than important. Of those commissioners holding professional or "other" primary occupations, 48.8 percent rated average size family farmers very important, 39.6 percent rated them important, and 11.6 percent rated them less than important.

Non-agricultural businessmen rated small subsistence farmers very important at 26.9 percent while 51.9 percent rated them important and 21.2 percent rated them less than important. Farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated this group very important at the 50.0 percent level with 45.5 percent rating them important and 3.6 percent rating them less than important. Of those commissioners engaged in professional and "other" main occupations, 46.5 percent rated small subsistence farmers very important, 39.6 percent important, and 13.9 percent less than important.

Of the three occupational groups, 9.6 percent of the non-agricultural businessmen rated local (domestic) farm laborers very important, 53.8 percent rated them important while 36.6 percent rated them less than important. This clientele group was rated very important by 16.4 percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen, with 58.2 percent of this group rating them important and 25.4 percent rating them less than important. Of the professional and "other" commissioners, 32.5 percent rated this group very important, 46.5 percent important, and 21.0 percent less than important.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between level of formal education and the agricultural clientele groups "homeowners" and "local (domestic) farm laborers."

Of those commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less, 33.8 percent rated homeowners very important, 52.9 percent rated them important, and 13.3 percent rated them less than important. In contrast, 12.2 percent of those whose highest level of education was college rated this group very important, 54.9 percent rated them important, and 32.9 percent rated them less than important.

Within the high school level group of commissioners, 25.0 percent rated local farm laborers very important, 60.2 percent rated them important, and 14.8 percent rated this clientele group less than important. On the other hand, 13.4 percent of those attending college rated the local farm laborers very important, 47.5 percent rated them important, and 39.1 percent rated them less than important.

Age: There was a significant association between age and the agricultural clientele groups "hobby farmers," "agricultural commodity organizations," and "local (domestic) farm laborers."

Thirty five and one-tenth percent of those commissioners forty five years of age and under rated hobby farmers important or very important, 45.6 percent rated them neutral, and 19.3 percent rated them unimportant or not very important. Of the commissioners over forty five years of age, 24.7 percent rated this clientele group important or very important, 31.2 percent neutral, and 44.1 percent unimportant or not very important.

Seventy one and nine-tenths percent of the commissioners forty five years of age and under rated agricultural commodity organizations important or very important while 28.1 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners over forty five years of age, 89.2 percent rated this clientele group important or very important while 10.8 percent rated them less than important.

Local (domestic) farm laborers were rated important or very important by 68.4 percent of the commissioners who were forty five years of age or under with 31.6 percent of this group rating them less than important. In contrast, 74.2 percent of those commissioners over forty five years of age rated this clientele group important or very important with 25.8 percent rating them less than important.

Residential Background: There was no significant association between residential background and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten agricultural clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the following agricultural clientele groups: (1) large commercial farmers, (2) average size family farmers, (3) agribusiness firms, (4) agricultural commodity groups, and (5) homeowners.

Of those commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be of little importance to important, 14.3 percent rated large commercial farmers very important, 40.8 percent rated them important, and 44.9 percent rated them less than important. Within the group of commissioners whose perception of the value of agriculture was very important, 24.4 percent rated this clientele group very important, 59.4 percent rated them important, and 15.8 percent rated them less than important.

Twenty six and one-half percent of the commissioners with the lower perception of the value of agriculture rated average size family farmers very important, 51.0 percent important, and 22.5 percent less than important. On the other hand, 52.5 percent of those with the higher perception of the value of agriculture rated this group very important, 40.6 percent important, and 6.9 percent less than important.

Sixty one and two-tenths percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be of little importance to important rated agribusiness firms important or very important while 38.8 percent rated the firms less than important. Seventy seven and two-tenths percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated this clientele group important or very important with 22.8 percent rating the group less than important.

Agricultural commodity organizations were rated important or very important by 71.4 percent of the commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture was of little importance to important. Twenty eight and six-tenths percent of the commissioners in this group also rated the commodity organizations less than important. In contrast, 88.1 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated agricultural commodity organizations important or very important while 11.9 percent rated them less than important.

With regard to homeowners, 10.2 percent of the commissioners with the lower perception of the value of agriculture rated this group very important, 61.2 percent important, 14.3 percent neutral, and 14.3 percent unimportant or not very important. Of those commissioners whose perception of the value of agriculture was very important, 27.7 percent rated homeowners very important, 50.5 percent important, 20.8 percent neutral, and 1.0 percent unimportant or not very important.

Home Economics Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is shown in Table 37.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the home economics clientele groups "farm homemakers" and "young married women."

Of the commissioners whose main occupation was non-agricultural businessman, 26.9 percent rated farm homemakers very important, 50.0 percent important, and 23.1 percent less than important. Homemakers were rated very important by 41.8 percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was farming or agricultural related business while 52.7 percent rated them important and 5.5 percent less than important. Thirty and two-tenths percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other" rated homeowners very important, 60.5 percent important, and 9.3 percent less than important.

Non-agricultural businessmen rated young married women very important at the 19.2 percent level while 46.2 percent rated them important and 34.6 percent rated them less than important. Thirty and nine-tenths percent of the farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated this clientele group very important, 58.2 percent important, and 10.9 percent less than important. Of the professional and "other" commissioners, 16.3 percent rated young married women very important, 62.8 percent important, and 20.9 percent less than important.

TABLE 37.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable home economics program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Farm homemakers	Rural non-farm homemakers	Small town and village homemakers	Urban and city homemakers	Low income homemakers	Middle income homemakers	Upper income homemakers	Senior citizens	Young married women	Homemakers from minority groups
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	NS	1	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	3	3	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	3	3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

Level of Education: There was a significant association between the level of formal education and the home economics clientele groups "middle income homemakers" and "young married women."

Commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less rated middle income homemakers very important at the 17.6 percent level while 66.2 percent rated this group important and 16.2 percent rated them less than important. Twelve and two-tenths percent of the commissioners who attended college rated the middle income homemakers very important, 51.2 percent important, and 36.6 percent less than important.

Young married women were rated very important by 30.9 percent of the commissioners whose highest level of education was high school or less while 57.3 percent of this group rated the young married women important and 11.8 percent rated them less than important. Fifteen and eight-tenths percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this clientele group very important, 53.7 percent important, and 30.5 percent less than important.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the following home economics clientele groups: (1) middle income homemakers, (2) senior citizens, and (3) young married women.

Commissioners with farm or rural non-farm backgrounds rated middle income homemakers very important at the 17.5 percent level with 65.0 percent rating them important and 17.5 percent less than important. Of the commissioners with "town" backgrounds, 11.4 percent rated the middle income homemakers very important, 50.0 percent important, and 38.6 percent less than important.

Thirty eight and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners with farm or rural backgrounds rated senior citizens very important, 42.5 percent rated them important, and 18.8 percent rated them less than important. In contrast, 20.0 percent of the "town" commissioners rated this clientele group very important, 57.1 percent important, and 22.9 percent less than important.

With regard to young married women, 28.7 percent of the commissioners with farm or rural backgrounds rated this group very important, 56.3 percent important, and 15.0 percent less than important. In contrast, 15.7 percent of the commissioners with "town" backgrounds rated this clientele group very important, 54.3 percent important, and 30.0 percent less than important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten home economics clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the home economics clientele group "homemakers from minority groups." Of those commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county was of little importance to important, 77.6 percent rated homemakers from minority groups important or very important while 22.4 percent rated them less than important. On the other hand, 74.2 percent of the commissioners who perceived the value of agriculture to be very important rated this clientele group important or very important while 25.8 percent rated them less than important.

Familiarity With Extension Service: There was a significant association between familiarity with the Extension Service and the home economics clientele groups "small town and village homemakers" and "urban and city homemakers."

Commissioners who were not very familiar with the Extension Service rated small town and village homemakers important or very important at the 53.1 percent level while 46.9 percent rated them less than important. Commissioners who were familiar with the Extension Service rated this clientele group important or very important at 79.1 percent, with 20.9 percent rating them less than important. Of those commissioners who were very familiar with Extension, 65.6 percent rated the small town and village homemakers important or very important and 34.4 percent rated them less than important.

Forty three and seven-tenths percent of the commissioners who were not very familiar with Extension rated urban and city homemakers important or very important while 56.3 percent rated them less than important. Of those commissioners who were familiar with Extension, 69.7 percent rated this clientele group important or very important and 30.3 percent rated them less than important. Urban and city homemakers were rated important or very important by 50.0 percent of the commissioners who were very familiar with Extension while the other fifty percent rated them less than important.

4-H (Youth Work) Clientele

A summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban (total) counties is

TABLE 38.--Summary of association of independent variables with the ten elements of the dependent variable 4-H (youth work) program clientele as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Farm youth	Rural non-farm youth	Small town and village youth	Urban and city youth	Youth from low income families	Youth from middle income families	Youth from upper income families	Youth from minority groups	All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	All youth between 7 and 19 years of age
Tenure	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Main occupation	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	3	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level of education	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1	1	NS	NS	NS
Age	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Residential background	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	2	NS	NS	NS	NS
Involvement in programs	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Economic value of agriculture	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3	NS
Familiarity with Extension	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

1 = Significant at .01 level
2 = Significant at .02 level
3 = Significant at .05 level

NS = Not significant at .05 level
0 = Data not suitable for chi-square analysis

shown in Table 38.

Tenure: There was no significant association between tenure and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Main Occupation: There was a significant association between main occupation and the 4-H (youth work) clientele groups "youth from low income families" and "youth from middle income families."

Twenty three and one-tenth percent of the commissioners whose main occupation was non-agricultural businessmen rated youth from low income families very important, 55.8 percent rated them important, and 21.1 percent rated them less than important. Forty percent of the commissioners who were farmers or agricultural related businessmen rated this clientele group very important, 58.2 percent rated them important, and 1.8 percent less than important. Of those commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other," 34.9 percent rated youth from low income families very important, 53.5 percent rated them important, and 11.6 percent rated them less than important.

Youth from middle income families were rated very important by 17.3 percent of the non-agricultural businessmen with 57.7 percent rating them important and 25.0 percent rating them less than important. Farmers and agricultural related businessmen rated youth from middle income families very important at 29.1 percent while 67.3 percent rated them important and 3.6 percent less than important. Of those commissioners whose main occupation was professional or "other," 25.6 percent rated this clientele group very important, 51.2 percent important, and 23.2 percent less than important.

Level of Education: There was a significant association between level of formal education and the 4-H (youth work) clientele groups "youth from middle income families" and "youth from upper income families."

Ninety seven percent of the commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less rated youth from middle income families important or very important, leaving three percent rating this clientele group less than important. In contrast, 71.9 percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this group important or very important with 28.1 percent rating it less than important.

Seventy six and one-half percent of the commissioners whose highest level of formal education was high school or less rated youth from upper income families important or very important while 23.5 percent rated this group less than important. Fifty percent of the commissioners who attended college rated this clientele group important or very important with the other fifty percent rating it less than important.

Age: There was no significant association between age and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Residential Background: There was a significant association between residential background and the 4-H (youth work) clientele group "youth from middle income families." This clientele group was rated important or very important by 92.6 percent of the commissioners with a farm or rural background. Seven and four-tenths percent of those commissioners rated the group less than important. Of those commissioners with a "town" background, 72.8 percent rated youth from middle income families important or very important and 27.2 percent rated them less than important.

Involvement in Extension Programs: There was no significant association between involvement in Extension programs and/or activities and the ten 4-H (youth work) clientele groups.

Economic Value of Agriculture to County: There was a significant association between perceived economic value of agriculture to the county and the 4-H (youth work) clientele group "all youth between nine and nineteen years of age." This group was rated important or very important by 87.8 percent of those commissioners whose perception of the economic value of agriculture was of little importance to important. It was rated less than important by 12.2 percent of those commissioners. In contrast, 97.1 percent of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county to be very important rated this clientele group important or very important with 2.9 percent rating it less than important.

Summary

This hypothesis can be partially rejected in that thirty of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. The significant associations are summarized in Tables 36, 37, and 38.

Summary

This section has presented data relative to the degree of association existing between eight independent variables and rural and urban county commissioners' perception of the relative importance of various elements of selected Extension program content and clientele. Chi square was used to test the significance of the associations. The chi-square values for all (126) statistically significant combinations of the independent and dependent variables are shown in Tables 57 through 182 in Appendix C. Association of independent variables with dependent variables, including levels of significance for statistically significant combinations, is summarized in Tables 21 through 38. All hypotheses were partially rejected.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the summary of the findings, the conclusions, and implications of this study. This study was concerned with the perceptions of county commissioners from Florida's fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties as the perceptions relate to the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs.

Objectives of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to explore and compare the perception of county commissioners from Florida's most rural and most urban counties concerning the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs. More specifically, the objectives of the study were:

1. To identify and compare selected personal and social characteristics of county commissioners from Florida's fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties;
2. To determine the relative importance attributed to selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs by the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties; and,
3. To determine the association between personal and social

characteristics of county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and fifteen most urban counties and the relative importance attributed to selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs.

Methodology

A questionnaire was used to collect data from county commissioners in thirty Florida counties. The counties were divided into two groups, the fifteen most rural counties and the fifteen most urban counties according to the definition given in the 1970 Census of Population-Florida. The questionnaire collected data about selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners as well as data concerning each county commissioner's perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs. Personal data collected included: tenure as a county commissioner, main occupation, highest level of formal education, age, residential background, extent of involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, perceived economic value of agriculture to the county, and familiarity with the Extension Service.

The data to determine each commissioner's perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs were collected from responses to 60 items on the questionnaire, twenty of which related to each of the three major program areas--agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work).

Frequency distributions and percentages were used to present the various elements of the county commissioners' personal data as well as the elements of perception by county commissioners from both rural and urban counties. Rank order scores were used for comparison between rural and urban counties, using Spearman's rho for rank correlation. The chi-square test was used to test the significance of association between the independent and dependent variables. Statistical analysis was based upon the .05 level of significance; however, all probability values for chi square have been indicated in the tables.

Findings

The first finding of this study will be a description and comparison of the county commissioners relating to the eight personal and social characteristics that made up the independent variables in this study. Also included will be a statement of the hypothesis relating to the personal and social characteristics of the commissioners with a summary of the findings.

Next will be a statement of the hypothesis and a summary of the findings relating to that part of the study having to do with a comparative analysis of rural and urban commissioners concerning their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs.

Finally, this will be followed by a statement of the six hypotheses relating to the perception of county commissioners from rural, urban, and rural and urban (total) counties concerning the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs, with a summary of findings after each.

Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners

County commissioners from rural and urban counties showed very similar personal and social characteristics in some respects but were very different in others. The typical county commissioner from the rural counties involved in this study was between 46 and 60 years of age with almost equal chances that he was serving his first, second, third, or more term as a county commissioner. He was probably engaged in farming or an agricultural related business as his main occupation and had spent the most significant portion of his life on a farm or in a rural area. He did not attend college. He felt very strongly that agriculture was very important to the economy of his county, had been directly involved in Extension programs and/or activities, though not a lot, and considered that he was familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service, though not very familiar.

In contrast, the typical county commissioner from the urban counties involved in this study was between 31 and 60 years of age and probably had served as a county commissioner less than four years. He was a non-agricultural businessman or in a professional position and not a farmer. He spent the most significant portion of his life in a town, in contrast to a rural area or on a farm, and was probably a college graduate. The commissioner from the urban county felt that agriculture was very important to the economy of the county though not as strongly as a commissioner from a rural county. He had been directly involved in Extension programs and/or activities some, though not a lot, and there was a good chance he had not been involved at all. He was familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service, though not very familiar.

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no significant difference between the county commissioners from the fifteen *most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning the following eight selected personal and social characteristics: (1) number of years as a commissioner (tenure), (2) main occupation, (3) level of education, (4) age, (5) residential background, (6) involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, (7) perception of the economic value of agriculture to the county, and (8) familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service.*

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that there were significant differences in four of the eight personal and social characteristics of commissioners from rural and urban counties. The characteristics in which there were significant differences were:

Main Occupation: Twenty percent of the commissioners from rural counties were non-agricultural businessmen opposed to forty nine percent of the commissioners from urban counties; twenty one percent of the rural commissioners were engaged in an agricultural related business in contrast to ten percent of the urban commissioners; forty percent of the rural commissioners were farmers in contrast to four percent of the urban commissioners; thirteen percent of the rural commissioners held professional positions compared to nineteen percent of the urban commissioners; and, seven percent of the rural commissioners were engaged in "other" main occupations contrasted with eighteen percent of the commissioners from urban counties.

Commissioners from rural and urban counties were significantly different in their main occupations. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Level of Education: Thirty three percent of the commissioners from rural counties did not graduate from high school in contrast to three percent of the commissioners from urban counties; thirty eight percent of the rural commissioners graduated from high school but did not attend college compared to nineteen percent of the urban commissioners; eighteen percent of the rural commissioners attended college less than four years opposed to thirty six percent of the urban commissioners; and, eleven percent of the rural commissioners attended college four or more years compared to forty two percent of the urban commissioners.

Commissioners from rural and urban counties were significantly different in the highest level of formal education completed. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Residential Background: Fifty four percent of the commissioners from rural counties spent the most significant portion of their life on a farm compared to nine percent of the commissioners from urban counties; thirty three percent of the rural commissioners had a rural non-farm residential background in contrast to thirteen percent of the urban commissioners; eleven percent of the rural commissioners spent the most significant portion of their life in a town of 10,000 persons or less compared to nine percent of the urban commissioners; and, for slightly over one percent of the rural commissioners their residential background was a town with over 10,000 persons contrasted with sixty nine percent of the urban commissioners.

Commissioners from rural and urban counties were significantly different in their residential backgrounds. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Involvement in Extension Programs: Fifteen percent of the commissioners from rural counties had not been directly involved in

Extension programs and/or activities compared to thirty percent of the urban commissioners; sixty seven percent of the rural commissioners had been involved in Extension programs some in contrast to forty four percent of the urban commissioners; and, eighteen percent of the rural commissioners had been involved "a lot" compared to twenty seven percent of the urban commissioners.

Commissioners from rural and urban counties were significantly different in the extent of their involvement in Extension programs and/or activities. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .02 level of significance.

There was no significant difference between commissioners from rural counties and commissioners from urban counties concerning the following personal and social characteristics: tenure as a county commissioner, age, perceived economic value of agriculture to the county, and familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service. Therefore, these elements of the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Extension Programs As Perceived By County Commissioners

A rank order distribution of Extension program content (subjects) and clientele (clientele groups) was used to compare and correlate rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of the relative importance of selected content and clientele. The rank orders were based on total scores which were obtained by multiplying the number of respondents selecting a particular response on the questionnaire times the value assigned to the response. The Spearman rho test for rank correlation was used to test the significance of correlation.

The null hypothesis relating to this section was: There is no association between the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties concerning their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Cooperative Extension Service programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H (youth work).

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that there were significant associations in the perceptions of rural and urban commissioners concerning the relative importance of all elements of the hypothesis except content of 4-H (youth work) programs. Those program areas in which similar perceptions were held by commissioners from rural and urban counties were:

Agricultural Content: Commissioners from rural and urban counties were similar in their perception of the relative importance of the ten selected agricultural subjects. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Home Economics Content: Commissioners from rural and urban counties were similar in their perception of the relative importance of the ten selected home economics subjects. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level of significance.

Agricultural Clientele: Commissioners from rural and urban counties were similar in their perception of the relative importance of the ten selected agricultural clientele groups. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level of significance.

Home Economics Clientele: Commissioners from rural and urban counties were similar in their perception of the relative importance of the ten selected home economics clientele groups. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level of significance.

4-H (Youth Work) Clientele: Commissioners from rural and urban counties were similar in their perception of the relative importance of the ten selected 4-H (youth work) clientele groups. This element of the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Commissioners from rural and urban counties did not reflect the similarity in perception of the relative importance of the ten selected 4-H (youth work) subjects that they did in the other elements of the hypothesis. This element of the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Association of Personal and Social Characteristics of County Commissioners With Their Perception of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs

The purpose of this section was to show the association between eight personal and social characteristics (independent variables) of the rural and urban commissioners and their perception of the relative importance of selected content and clientele of Extension programs (dependent variable). The independent variables were: (1) number of years as a county commissioner (tenure), (2) main occupation, (3) level of formal education, (4) age, (5) residential background, (6) involvement in Extension programs and/or activities, (7) perceived economic value of agriculture to the county, and (8) familiarity with the Extension Service.

The association of the independent and dependent variables was analyzed using chi-square techniques. Chi-square values were computed from actual numerical frequencies. The six hypotheses relating to this section and a summary of their findings follow.

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that fourteen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and the commissioners' perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. There were ten significant associations relating to agriculture, three significant associations relating to home economics, and one significant association relating to 4-H (youth work).

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that seventeen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. There were nine significant associations relating to agriculture, three relating to home economics, and five relating to 4-H (youth work).

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program content.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that thirty five of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners perception of selected Extension program content were statistically significant. There were eighteen significant associations relating to agriculture, nine to home economics, and eight to 4-H (youth work).

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that eleven of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. There were seven significant associations relating to agriculture, two relating to home economics, and two relating to 4-H (youth work).

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that nineteen of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. There were nine significant associations relating to agriculture, two to home economics, and eight to 4-H (youth work).

There is no association between eight selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners from the fifteen most rural and the fifteen most urban counties and their perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program clientele.

This hypothesis was partially rejected in that thirty of the 240 combinations of independent variables and commissioners' perception of selected Extension program clientele were statistically significant. There were fourteen significant associations relating to agriculture, ten relating to home economics, and six relating to 4-H (youth work).

In total, there were 126 statistically significant associations between independent and dependent variables out of a possible 1440 combinations.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the analyses and interpretations of the data obtained in this study.

1. With few exceptions, both rural and urban county commissioners were highly supportive of the Extension program content and clientele with which this study was concerned. It is therefore concluded that the commissioners relate Extension programs to the needs of society and find them worthy of continued financial support.
2. Based upon the degree to which the commissioners from both groups expressed support for Extension program content and clientele, it appears that the Cooperative Extension Service occupies a favorable image in the minds of the commissioners.
3. In so far as the 60 elements of Extension program content and clientele in this study represent state and national program priorities, and in so far as the instrument used was sufficiently sensitive to accurately measure the perception of county

commissioners, it is concluded that state and national priorities are generally compatible with county priorities.

4. Even though a change in Extension philosophy in recent years, and consequently a change in some Extension program priorities, has met with both favor and disfavor among the general public, county commissioners from both rural and urban counties favorably accept most current and proposed Extension programs, as presented in this study, which reflect present Extension philosophy.
5. Although there were significant personal and social differences between the two commissioner groups, there was not a polarization of commissioners from rural counties toward traditional agricultural or rural program content and clientele and commissioners from urban counties toward non-traditional, more socially oriented program content and clientele.
6. Commissioners from both rural and urban counties reflect a positive concern for both the economic impact of agriculture on the county as well as environmental quality and ecological balance.

Implications

Although the conclusions drawn from this study are generally favorable to the Cooperative Extension Service, the study suggests the following implications for the Extension Service:

1. As the county commissioners from rural and urban counties differ considerably in certain personal and social characteristics, and as such differences can influence their perception, Extension administrators, supervisors, and agents should seriously consider the personal and social differences of commissioners in their

working relationship. It seems logical to assume that such consideration should create better understanding and strengthen the organization's effectiveness.

2. In that the commissioners from both rural and urban counties strongly support agriculture, the Extension Service should continue to plan and implement sound educational programs in agriculture. As a majority of commissioners from both groups felt that agriculture was very important to the economy of the county, it would seem that the Extension Service has a responsibility to help keep agriculture economically strong in the counties.
3. Since many of the commissioners who perceived the economic value of agriculture to the county as very important also perceived many of the other elements of Extension program content and clientele to be important or very important, it would appear beneficial to the Extension Service to create in the minds of all commissioners an awareness of and appreciation for the economic impact of agriculture on the county. Commissioners should also be apprised of Extension's educational role in the area of agriculture.
4. Since a significant number of county commissioners have never been involved in Extension programs and are not familiar with the Extension Service, Extension needs to take positive steps to not only familiarize but actually involve county commissioners in its educational programs and activities. Also, a system of continuous effective communication should be initiated where such does not presently exist.
5. In view of the high correlation (with the exception of 4-H

subject matter) between rural and urban commissioners concerning the relative importance of Extension program content and clientele, the Extension Service should find support for developing and implementing many programs "across the board" regardless of the rural-urban orientation of counties.

6. In view of the rural and urban commissioners' differences of opinion concerning 4-H (youth work) subject matter, the Extension Service should provide 4-H work in broad areas of interest for young people in contrast to the traditional agricultural and home economics areas only.
7. County Extension directors, county home economics agents, and district supervisors should re-evaluate efforts expended in the home economics subject matter areas of "cultural arts," "renovation of furniture," and "use of leisure time" in view of the low priority given these subjects by the commissioners from both rural and urban counties.
8. County Extension directors, home economics agents, 4-H coordinators, and district supervisors should re-evaluate efforts expended with "urban and city" and "upper income" youth and home economics clientele in view of the lower priority given these groups by both rural and urban commissioners.
9. County Extension directors, county agricultural agents, and district supervisors should analyze the amount of time and effort expended for large commercial farmers and hobby farmers in view of the lower priority given these groups in relation to the average size family farmer.

10. Generally, Extension agents in the counties can feel reasonably secure in the knowledge that the county commissioners support Extension's efforts toward fulfilling the needs of society. Such support should not be taken for granted, however, and Extension agents should continue to involve local advisory committees in the development and implementation of Extension programs in an effort to continue to meet the needs of society and merit the support of county commissioners.
11. County Extension staffs should be made aware of commissioners' perceptions of Extension program content and clientele so they will be in a position to anticipate commissioner reaction to programs proposed by clientele groups. An understanding of commissioners' perceptions should put Extension agents in a more favorable position for giving leadership to the resolution of conflicting perceptual values between commissioners and clientele groups.

The conclusions and implications drawn from the data of this study relate only to the counties involved in the study. No generalization to other counties is specified or implied.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

2002 McCarty Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

The Cooperative Extension Service is a cooperative Federal-State-County agency. We who work with County Extension Agents throughout the State of Florida are most appreciative of the very fine support County Commissioners give to Extension's effort to help people in Florida help themselves through educational programs.

Because the Extension Service is your business as well as ours, I am conducting a study to determine your opinions concerning selected subject matter and clientele (groups with whom Extension works) of Extension programs. I will be most appreciative of your cooperation in the study.

A questionnaire is attached which should take only a few minutes to complete. I am hopeful that you will treat it seriously and give me the benefit of your very frank feelings about the items listed in the questionnaire.

Here are the instructions:

1. Please read each item carefully.
2. Please select only one answer per item.
3. Please answer every item.
4. When completed, please place the questionnaire in the attached envelope, seal it so it will be confidential, and return it to the person handling the survey in your county.
5. Please take time to complete and return the questionnaire now rather than taking it home to return later.

Your interest and cooperation are deeply appreciated.

Yours very truly,

Earl M. Kelly
District Agent
Florida Cooperative Extension Service

___ ___County

QUESTIONNAIRE

(5) 1. How long have you served as a county commissioner? (Check one)

a.________less than 4 years

b.________between 4 and 8 years

c.________over 8 years

(6) 2. What is your main occupation? (Check or write in the one which you consider your main occupation)

a.________businessman (non-agricultural)

b.________businessman (agricultural related)

c.________farmer

d.________professional

e.________other (specify)________________________________

(7) 3. What was the highest level you completed in school? (Check one)

a.________less than high school

b.________high school, but no college

c.________some college, but less than four years

d.________four years or more of college

(8) 4. To which of the following age groups do you belong? (Check one)

a.________30 years or younger

b.________31 to 45 years

c.________46 to 60 years

d.________61 years or older

(9) 5. In what situation have you spent the most significant portion of your life? (Check only one)

a.________on a farm

b.________rural, but not on a farm

c.________town up to 10,000 persons

d.________town over 10,000 persons

(10) 6. To what extent have you been directly involved in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities? (Check one)

a.________none

b.________some

c.________a lot

(11) 7. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the economic value of agriculture to your county? (Check one)

a.________of little importance

b.________important

c.________very important

(12) 8. Which of the following best describes your familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service? (Check one)

a.________not very familiar

b.________familiar

c.________very familiar

AGRICULTURAL SUBJECTS

The Extension Service conducts educational programs concerning many different subjects in agriculture. Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each agricultural subject listed below.

(Please answer each item)

			Unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(13)	1.	Production of agricultural products...........	X	X	X	X	X
(14)	2.	Processing of agricultural products...........	X	X	X	X	X
(15)	3.	Marketing of agricultural products...........	X	X	X	X	X
(16)	4.	Farm business management.........	X	X	X	X	X
(17)	5.	Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard...	X	X	X	X	X
(18)	6.	Agricultural labor relations..........	X	X	X	X	X
(19)	7.	Management of timberlands........	X	X	X	X	X
(20)	8.	Public affairs education (understanding public issues).....	X	X	X	X	X
(21)	9.	Land use planning (includes county-wide development).	X	X	X	X	X
(22)	10.	Proper use and conservation of natural resources..	X	X	X	X	X

HOME ECONOMICS SUBJECTS

The Extension Service conducts educational programs concerning many different subjects in home economics. Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each home economics subject listed below.

(Please answer each item)

		unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(23)	1. Clothing construction.......	X	X	X	X	X
(24)	2. Renovating furniture..........	X	X	X	X	X
(25)	3. Foods and nutrition	X	X	X	X	X
(26)	4. Cultural arts (understanding and appreciation for music, art, etc.)..	X	X	X	X	X
(27)	5. Leadership development........	X	X	X	X	X
(28)	6. Use of leisure time..............	X	X	X	X	X
(29)	7. Consumer education.	X	X	X	X	X
(30)	8. Family life education..........	X	X	X	X	X
(31)	9. Job preparation (developing the basic skills to apply for and hold a job)........	X	X	X	X	X
(32)	10. Efficient use of food stamps........	X	X	X	X	X

4-H (YOUTH WORK) SUBJECTS

The Extension Service conducts educational programs concerning many different subjects in 4-H (youth work). Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each 4-H (youth work) subject listed below.

(Please answer each item)

		unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(33)	1. Homemaking skills (girls)............	X	X	X	X	X
(34)	2. Agricultural skills (boys).............	X	X	X	X	X
(35)	3. Community development........	X	X	X	X	X
(36)	4. Understanding and improving the environment........	X	X	X	X	X
(37)	5. Understanding public issues (public affairs)...	X	X	X	X	X
(38)	6. Understanding economics and the American business system.............	X	X	X	X	X
(39)	7. Career exploration.	X	X	X	X	X
(40)	8. Health education...	X	X	X	X	X
(41)	9. Personal development........	X	X	X	X	X
(42)	10. Food-nutrition.....	X	X	X	X	X

AGRICULTURAL GROUPS

The Extension Service works with many different groups of people. Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each agricultural group listed below.

(Please answer each item)

		unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(43)	1. Large commercial farmers (producers)	X	X	X	X	X
(44)	2. Average size family farmers.....	X	X	X	X	X
(45)	3. Small subsistence (low income) farmers............	X	X	X	X	X
(46)	4. Part-time farmers (operator works off farm more than 100 days per year)......	X	X	X	X	X
(47)	5. Hobby farmers......	X	X	X	X	X
(48)	6. Agribusiness firms (supply and/or service agriculture)	X	X	X	X	X
(49)	7. Agricultural commodity organizations (such as Cattleman's Association, etc.).	X	X	X	X	X
(50)	8. Homeowners.........	X	X	X	X	X
(51)	9. Local (domestic) farm laborers......	X	X	X	X	X
(52)	10. Migrant farm laborers...........	X	X	X	X	X

HOME ECONOMICS GROUPS

The Extension Service works with many different groups of people. Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each home economics group listed below.

(Please answer each item)

		unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(53)	1. Farm homemakers (live on the farm).	X	X	X	X	X
(54)	2. Rural non-farm homemakers (live in rural areas but not on a farm).....	X	X	X	X	X
(55)	3. Small town and village homemakers.	X	X	X	X	X
(56)	4. Urban and city homemakers.........	X	X	X	X	X
(57)	5. Low income homemakers.........	X	X	X	X	X
(58)	6. Middle income homemakers.........	X	X	X	X	X
(59)	7. Upper income homemakers.........	X	X	X	X	X
(60)	8. Senior citizens....	X	X	X	X	X
(61)	9. Young married women (under 30 years of age)......	X	X	X	X	X
(62)	10. Homemakers from minority groups....	X	X	X	X	X

4-H (YOUTH WORK) GROUPS

The Extension Service works with many different groups of people. Please circle the "X" which best describes the relative importance you place on each 4-H (youth work) group listed below.

(Please answer each item)

			unimpt.	not very impt.	neutral	impt.	very impt.
(63)	1.	Farm youth (live on the farm).......	X	X	X	X	X
(64)	2.	Rural non-farm youth (live in rural areas but not on a farm).........	X	X	X	X	X
(65)	3.	Small town and village youth......	X	X	X	X	X
(66)	4.	Urban and city youth..............	X	X	X	X	X
(67)	5.	Youth from low income families....	X	X	X	X	X
(68)	6.	Youth from middle income families....	X	X	X	X	X
(69)	7.	Youth from upper income families....	X	X	X	X	X
(70)	8.	Youth from minority groups....	X	X	X	X	X
(71)	9.	All youth between 9 and 19 years of age (official 4-H Club age limits)...	X	X	X	X	X
(72)	10.	All youth between 7 and 19 years of age (adds 7 and 8 year olds to official 4-H Club age limits)............	X	X	X	X	X

To make sure all districts in selected counties are represented in this study, please check the district you represent: #1___ #2___ #3___ #4___ #5___, other___, (please specify_________).

APPENDIX B

PERCEPTIONS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONCERNING SELECTED CONTENT AND CLIENTELE OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS

TABLE 39.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural subjects[1]

Agricultural Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Production of agricultural products	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	14	19.4	56	77.8
Processing of agricultural products	0	0.0	4	5.6	1	1.4	36	50.0	31	43.0
Marketing of agricultural products	0	0.0	1	1.4	3	4.2	16	22.2	52	72.2
Farm business management	1	1.4	2	2.8	3	4.2	31	43.0	35	48.6
Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	1	1.4	12	16.7	12	16.7	40	55.5	7	9.7
Agricultural labor relations	1	1.4	6	8.3	6	8.3	29	40.3	30	41.7
Management of timberlands	1	1.4	3	4.2	4	5.6	40	55.5	24	33.3
Public affairs education	1	1.4	3	4.2	2	2.8	41	56.9	25	34.7
Land use planning	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.6	30	41.6	37	51.4
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.2	27	37.5	42	58.3

---

[1] N = 72

TABLE 40.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of home economics subjects[1]

Home Economics Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Clothing construction	1	1.4	2	2.8	13	18.0	46	63.9	10	13.9
Renovating furniture	3	4.2	12	16.7	16	22.2	38	52.7	3	4.2
Foods and nutrition	0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.8	35	48.6	34	47.2
Cultural arts (understanding and appreciation for music, art, etc.)	3	4.2	13	18.0	26	36.1	27	37.5	3	4.2
Leadership development	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	41	56.9	29	40.3
Use of leisure time	4	5.5	10	13.9	11	15.3	35	48.6	12	16.7
Consumer education	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	7.0	51	70.8	16	22.2
Family life education	1	1.4	1	1.4	5	7.0	37	51.4	28	38.8
Job preparation (developing the basic skills to apply for and hold a job)	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.8	36	50.0	34	47.2
Efficient use of food stamps	3	4.2	3	4.2	10	13.9	31	43.0	25	34.7

[1] N = 72

TABLE 41.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) subjects[1]

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Homemaking skills (girls)	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.2	45	62.5	24	33.3
Agricultural skills (boys)	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	38	52.8	33	45.8
Community development	0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.8	40	55.5	29	40.3
Understanding and improving the environment	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.6	40	55.5	28	38.9
Understanding public issues (public affairs)	0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.8	31	43.0	38	52.8
Understanding economics and the American business system	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.3	36	50.0	30	41.7
Career exploration	2	2.8	1	1.4	9	12.5	35	48.6	25	34.7
Health education	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.6	33	45.8	34	47.2
Personal development	1	1.4	0	0.0	4	5.6	35	48.6	32	44.4
Food-nutrition	0	0.0	1	1.4	3	4.2	35	48.6	33	45.8

[1] N = 72

TABLE 42.--Urban county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural subjects[1]

Agricultural Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Production of agricultural products	0	0.0	4	5.1	4	5.1	28	35.9	42	53.9
Processing of agricultural products	2	2.6	4	5.1	10	12.8	29	37.2	33	42.3
Marketing of agricultural products	1	1.3	1	1.3	6	7.7	25	32.0	45	57.7
Farm business management	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.7	37	47.4	33	42.3
Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	0	0.0	2	2.6	9	11.5	46	59.0	21	26.9
Agricultural labor relations	2	2.6	7	9.0	16	20.5	27	34.6	26	33.3
Management of timberlands	0	0.0	8	10.3	6	7.7	28	35.9	36	46.1
Public affairs education	2	2.6	1	1.3	5	6.4	31	39.7	39	50.0
Land use planning	1	1.3	3	3.8	5	6.4	22	28.2	47	60.3
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	14	17.9	63	80.8

[1] N = 78

TABLE 43.--Urban county commissioners' perceptions of home economics subjects[1]

Home Economics Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Clothing construction	2	2.6	9	11.5	21	26.9	37	47.4	9	11.6
Renovating furniture	3	3.9	17	21.8	33	42.3	22	28.2	3	3.8
Foods and nutrition	2	2.6	0	0.0	5	6.4	25	32.1	46	58.9
Cultural arts (understanding and appreciation for music, art, etc.)	3	3.9	9	11.5	28	35.9	30	38.5	8	10.2
Leadership development	1	1.3	3	3.9	7	8.9	33	42.3	34	43.6
Use of leisure time	4	5.1	4	5.1	17	21.8	35	44.9	18	23.1
Consumer education	1	1.3	1	1.3	9	11.5	39	50.0	28	35.9
Family life education	3	3.9	0	0.0	10	12.8	39	50.0	26	33.3
Job preparation (developing the basic skills to apply for and hold a job)	2	2.6	0	0.0	7	8.9	31	39.8	38	48.7
Efficient use of food stamps	8	10.3	4	5.1	19	24.4	22	28.2	25	32.0

[1] N = 78

TABLE 44.--Urban county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) subjects[1]

4-H (Youth Work) Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Homemaking skills (girls)	1	1.3	2	2.6	6	7.7	38	48.7	31	39.7
Agricultural skills (boys)	0	0.0	1	1.3	8	10.3	43	55.1	26	33.3
Community development	1	1.3	3	3.8	3	3.8	43	55.1	28	36.0
Understanding and improving the environment	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	3.8	30	38.5	44	56.4
Understanding public issues (public affairs)	1	1.3	2	2.6	4	5.1	32	41.0	39	50.0
Understanding economics and the American business system	1	1.3	0	0.0	9	11.5	35	44.9	33	42.3
Career exploration	3	3.8	0	0.0	8	10.3	42	53.9	25	32.0
Health education	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	2.6	32	41.0	43	55.1
Personal development	2	2.6	0	0.0	6	7.7	33	42.3	37	47.4
Food-nutrition	1	1.3	1	1.3	6	7.7	36	46.1	34	43.6

[1] N = 78

TABLE 45.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural groups[1]

Agricultural Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Large commercial farmers	2	2.8	8	11.1	5	6.9	43	59.7	14	19.5
Average size family farmers	1	1.4	3	4.2	4	5.6	25	34.7	39	54.1
Small subsistence (low income) farmers	1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.2	34	47.2	33	45.8
Part-time farmers (operator works off farm more than 100 days per year)	5	6.9	4	5.6	17	23.6	39	54.2	7	9.7
Hobby farmers	13	18.1	15	20.8	27	37.5	15	20.8	2	2.8
Agribusiness firms (supply and/or service agriculture)	1	1.4	4	5.6	11	15.3	43	59.7	13	18.0
Agricultural commodity organizations (such as Cattleman's Association, etc.)	0	0.0	3	4.2	10	13.9	37	51.4	22	30.5
Homeowners	0	0.0	3	4.2	12	16.6	39	54.2	18	25.0
Local (domestic) farm laborers	1	1.4	3	4.2	17	23.6	36	50.0	15	20.8
Migrant farm laborers	6	8.3	11	15.3	31	43.1	20	27.8	4	5.5

[1] N = 72

TABLE 46.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of home economics groups[1]

Home Economics Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm homemakers (live on the farm)	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.6	43	59.7	24	33.3
Rural non-farm homemakers (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	0	0.0	7	9.7	17	23.6	37	51.4	11	15.3
Small town and village homemakers	0	0.0	4	5.6	12	16.7	43	59.7	13	18.0
Urban and city homemakers	1	1.4	4	5.6	21	29.1	37	51.4	9	12.5
Low income homemakers	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.3	48	66.7	18	25.0
Middle income homemakers	0	0.0	1	1.4	11	15.3	47	65.3	13	18.0
Upper income homemakers	3	4.2	7	9.7	22	30.6	33	45.8	7	9.7
Senior citizens	1	1.4	1	1.4	9	12.5	33	45.8	28	38.9
Young married women (under 30 years of age)	1	1.4	1	1.4	6	8.3	44	61.1	20	27.8
Homemakers from minority groups	0	0.0	2	2.8	14	19.4	41	57.0	15	20.8

[1] N = 72

TABLE 47.--Rural county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) groups[1]

4-H (Youth Work) Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm youth (live on the farm)	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	35	48.6	36	50.0
Rural non-farm youth (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	0	0.0	2	2.8	10	13.9	43	59.7	17	23.6
Small town and village youth	0	0.0	3	4.2	8	11.1	40	55.5	21	29.2
Urban and city youth	0	0.0	4	5.6	16	22.2	37	51.4	15	20.8
Youth from low income families	0	0.0	2	2.8	2	2.8	39	54.1	29	40.3
Youth from middle income families	0	0.0	2	2.8	2	2.8	47	65.3	21	29.1
Youth from upper income families	1	1.4	4	5.6	15	20.8	36	50.0	16	22.2
Youth from minority groups	0	0.0	3	4.2	10	13.9	37	51.4	22	30.5
All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	45	62.5	26	36.1
All youth between 7 and 19 years of age	1	1.4	1	1.4	9	12.5	38	52.8	23	31.9

---

[1] N = 72

TABLE 48. --Urban county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural groups[1]

Agricultural Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Large commercial farmers	1	1.3	10	12.8	12	15.4	37	47.4	18	23.1
Average size family farmers	0	0.0	3	3.9	7	8.9	41	52.6	27	34.6
Small subsistence (low income farmers	0	0.0	2	2.6	12	15.4	35	44.8	29	37.2
Part-time farmers (operator works off farm more than 100 days per year)	1	1.3	10	12.8	21	27.0	37	47.4	9	11.5
Hobby farmers	3	3.9	21	26.9	28	35.9	23	29.5	3	3.8
Agribusiness firms (supply and/or service agriculture)	3	3.9	10	12.8	13	16.7	42	53.8	10	12.8
Agricultural commodity organizations (such as Cattleman's Association, etc.)	1	1.3	6	7.7	6	7.7	47	60.2	18	23.1
Homeowners	2	2.6	3	3.9	16	20.5	42	53.8	15	19.2
Local (domestic) farm laborers	4	5.1	5	6.4	12	15.4	44	56.4	13	16.7
Migrant farm laborers	5	6.4	6	7.7	18	23.1	33	42.3	16	20.5

---

[1] N = 78

TABLE 49.--Urban county commissioners' perceptions of home economics groups[1]

Home Economics Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm homemakers (live on the farm)	2	2.6	3	3.9	9	11.5	38	48.7	26	33.3
Rural non-farm homemakers (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	2	2.6	7	9.0	20	25.6	43	55.1	6	7.7
Small town and village homemakers	2	2.6	2	2.6	24	30.7	44	56.4	6	7.7
Urban and city homemakers	2	2.6	7	9.0	25	32.0	38	48.7	6	7.7
Low income homemakers	2	2.6	0	0.0	13	16.6	40	51.3	23	29.5
Middle income homemakers	2	2.6	4	5.1	23	29.5	40	51.3	9	11.5
Upper income homemakers	6	7.7	10	12.8	28	35.9	30	38.5	4	5.1
Senior citizens	2	2.6	4	5.1	14	17.9	41	52.6	17	21.3
Young married women (under 30 years of age)	2	2.6	2	2.6	21	26.9	39	50.0	14	17.9
Homemakers from minority groups	4	5.1	1	1.3	16	20.5	38	48.7	19	24.4

---

[1] N = 78

TABLE 50.--Urban county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) groups[1]

4-H (Youth Work) Groups	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm youth (live on the farm)	0	0.0	1	1.3	7	9.0	38	48.7	32	41.0
Rural non-farm youth (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	0	0.0	4	5.1	17	21.8	39	50.0	18	23.1
Small town and village youth	0	0.0	3	3.8	16	20.5	40	51.3	19	24.4
Urban and city youth	1	1.3	8	10.3	19	24.4	38	48.7	12	15.3
Youth from low income families	1	1.3	3	3.9	9	11.5	45	57.7	20	25.6
Youth from middle income families	1	1.3	6	7.7	14	17.9	42	53.9	15	19.2
Youth from upper income families	2	2.6	14	17.9	21	26.9	33	42.3	8	10.3
Youth from minority groups	3	3.9	3	3.9	10	12.8	39	50.0	23	29.4
All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	1	1.3	1	1.3	6	7.7	37	47.4	33	42.3
All youth between 7 and 19 years of age	1	1.3	2	2.6	7	8.9	39	50.0	29	37.2

[1] N = 78

TABLE 51.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural subjects[1]

Agricultural Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Production of agricultural products	0	0.0	5	3.3	5	3.3	42	28.0	98	65.4
Processing of agricultural products	2	1.3	8	5.3	11	7.3	65	43.4	64	42.7
Marketing of agricultural products	1	.7	2	1.3	9	6.0	41	27.3	97	64.7
Farm business management	1	.7	4	2.7	9	6.0	68	45.3	68	45.3
Lawns, plants, and trees in the yard	1	.7	14	9.3	21	14.0	86	57.3	28	18.7
Agricultural labor relations	3	2.0	13	8.7	22	14.7	56	37.3	56	37.3
Management of timberlands	1	.7	11	7.3	10	6.7	68	45.3	60	40.0
Public affairs education	3	2.0	4	2.7	7	4.7	72	48.0	64	42.6
Land use planning	1	.7	4	2.7	9	6.0	52	34.6	84	56.0
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.7	41	27.3	105	70.0

---

[1] N = 150

TABLE 52.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of home economics subjects[1]

Home Economics Subjects	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Clothing construction	3	2.0	11	7.3	34	22.7	83	55.3	19	12.7
Renovating furniture	6	4.0	29	19.3	49	32.7	60	40.0	6	4.0
Foods and nutrition	2	1.3	1	.7	7	4.7	60	40.0	80	53.3
Cultural arts (understanding and appreciation for music, art, etc.)	6	4.0	22	14.7	54	36.0	57	38.0	11	7.3
Leadership development	1	.7	4	2.7	8	5.3	74	49.3	63	42.0
Use of leisure time	8	5.3	14	9.3	28	18.7	70	46.7	30	20.0
Consumer education	1	.7	1	.7	14	9.3	90	60.0	44	29.3
Family life education	4	2.7	1	.7	15	10.0	76	50.6	54	36.0
Job preparation (developing the basic skills to apply for and hold a job)	2	1.3	0	0.0	9	6.0	67	44.7	72	48.0
Efficient use of food stamps	11	7.3	7	4.7	29	19.4	53	35.3	50	33.3

---

[1] N = 150

TABLE 53.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) subjects[1]

	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Homemaking skills (girls)	1	.7	2	1.3	9	6.0	83	55.3	55	36.7
Agricultural skills (boys)	0	0.0	2	1.3	8	5.3	81	54.0	59	39.4
Community development	1	.7	4	2.7	5	3.3	83	55.3	57	38.0
Understanding and improving the environment	0	0.0	1	.7	7	4.7	70	46.6	72	48.0
Understanding public issues (public affairs)	1	.7	3	2.0	6	4.0	63	42.0	77	51.3
Understanding economics and the American business system	1	.7	0	0.0	15	10.0	71	47.3	63	42.0
Career exploration	5	3.3	1	.7	17	11.3	77	51.3	50	33.4
Health education	1	.7	1	.7	6	4.0	65	43.3	77	51.3
Personal development	3	2.0	0	0.0	10	6.7	68	45.3	69	46.0
Food-nutrition	1	.7	2	1.3	9	6.0	71	47.3	67	44.7

---

[1] N = 150

TABLE 54.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of agricultural groups[1]

	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Large commercial farmers	3	2.0	18	12.0	17	11.4	80	53.3	32	21.3
Average size family farmers	1	.7	6	4.0	11	7.3	66	44.0	66	44.0
Small subsistence (low income) farmers	1	.7	3	2.0	15	10.0	69	46.0	62	41.3
Part-time farmers (operator works off farm more than 100 days per year)	6	4.0	14	9.3	38	25.3	76	50.7	16	10.7
Hobby farmers	16	10.7	36	24.0	55	36.7	38	25.3	5	3.3
Agribusiness firms (supply and/or service agriculture)	4	2.7	14	9.3	24	16.0	85	56.7	23	15.3
Agricultural commodity organizations (such as Cattleman's Association, etc.)	1	.7	9	6.0	16	10.7	84	56.0	40	26.6
Homeowners	2	1.3	6	4.0	28	18.7	81	54.0	33	22.0
Local (domestic) farm laborers	5	3.3	8	5.3	29	19.4	80	53.3	28	18.7
Migrant farm laborers	11	7.3	17	11.3	49	32.7	53	35.4	20	13.3

[1] N = 150

TABLE 55.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of home economics groups[1]

	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm homemakers (live on the farm)	2	1.3	4	2.7	13	8.7	81	54.0	50	33.3
Rural non-farm homemakers (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	2	1.3	14	9.3	37	24.7	80	53.4	17	11.3
Small town and village homemakers	2	1.3	6	4.0	36	24.0	87	58.0	19	12.7
Urban and city homemakers	3	2.0	11	7.3	46	30.7	75	50.0	15	10.0
Low income homemakers	2	1.3	0	0.0	19	12.7	88	58.7	41	27.3
Middle income homemakers	2	1.3	5	3.3	34	22.7	87	58.0	22	14.7
Upper income homemakers	9	6.0	17	11.3	50	33.3	63	42.0	11	7.4
Senior citizens	3	2.0	5	3.3	23	15.3	74	49.4	45	30.0
Young married women (under 30 years of age)	3	2.0	3	2.0	27	18.0	83	55.3	34	22.7
Homemakers from minority groups	4	2.7	3	2.0	30	20.0	79	52.6	34	22.7

---

[1] N = 150

TABLE 56.--Rural and urban county commissioners' perceptions of 4-H (youth work) groups[1]

	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm youth (live on the farm)	0	0.0	1	.7	8	5.3	73	48.7	68	45.3
Rural non-farm youth (live in rural areas but not on a farm)	0	0.0	6	4.0	27	18.0	82	54.7	35	23.3
Small town and village youth	0	0.0	6	4.0	24	16.0	80	53.3	40	26.7
Urban and city youth	1	.7	12	8.0	35	23.3	75	50.0	27	18.0
Youth from low income families	1	.7	5	3.3	11	7.3	84	56.0	49	32.7
Youth from middle income families	1	.7	8	5.3	16	10.7	89	59.3	36	24.0
Youth from upper income families	3	2.0	18	12.0	36	24.0	69	46.0	24	16.0
Youth from minority groups	3	2.0	6	4.0	20	13.3	76	50.7	45	30.0
All youth between 9 and 19 years of age	1	.7	1	.7	7	4.7	82	54.6	59	39.3
All youth between 7 and 19 years of age	2	1.3	3	2.0	16	10.7	77	51.3	52	34.7

---

[1] N = 150

APPENDIX C

CHI-SQUARE TABLES OF INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

TABLE 57.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0
Very important	7	13.0	47	87.0	54	100.0
Total	16	22.2	56	77.8	72	100.0

$X^2 = 8.679$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 58.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0
Very important	11	20.4	43	79.6	54	100.0
Total	20	27.8	52	72.2	72	100.0

$X^2 = 4.523$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 59.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "management of timberlands"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	13	92.9	1	7.1	14	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	25	56.8	19	43.2	44	100.0
Professional and other	10	71.4	4	28.6	14	100.0
Total	48	66.7	24	33.3	72	100.0

X^2 = 6.385   d.f. = 2   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 60.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	9	40.9	13	59.1	22	100.0
Over 45 years	7	14.0	43	86.0	50	100.0
Total	16	22.2	56	77.8	72	100.0

X^2 = 4.938   d.f. = 1   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 61.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "management of timberlands"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	22	91.7	2	8.3	24	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	14	51.9	13	48.1	27	100.0
Over 8 years	12	57.1	9	42.9	21	100.0
Total	48	66.7	24	33.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 10.274$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 62.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "land use planning"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	16	66.7	8	33.3	24	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	7	25.9	20	74.1	27	100.0
Over 8 years	12	57.1	9	42.9	21	100.0
Total	35	48.6	37	51.4	72	100.0

$X^2 = 9.306$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 63.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	12	54.5	10	45.5	22	100.0
Over 45 years	13	26.0	37	74.0	50	100.0
Total	25	34.7	47	65.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 4.305$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 64.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "management of timberlands"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	19	86.4	3	13.6	22	100.0
Over 45 years	29	58.0	21	42.0	50	100.0
Total	48	66.7	24	33.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 4.328$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 65.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	25	39.7	38	60.3	63	100.0
Town	0	00.0	9	100.0	9	100.0
Total	25	34.7	47	65.3	72	100.0

X^2 = 3.860 d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 66.--Association between the residential background on the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	30	47.6	33	52.4	63	100.0
Town	0	00.0	9	100.0	9	100.0
Total	30	41.7	42	58.3	72	100.0

X^2 = 5.518 d.f. = 1 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 67.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	15	75.0	5	25.0	20	100.0
Familiar	16	40.0	24	60.0	40	100.0
Very familiar	5	27.8	13	72.2	18	100.0
Total	36	46.2	42	53.8	78	100.0

$X^2 = 9.752$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 68.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	23	44.2	29	55.8	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	12	21.8	43	78.2	55	100.0
Professional and other	17	39.5	26	60.5	43	100.0
Total	52	34.7	98	65.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.559$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 69.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.4	18	58.1	7	22.5	31	100.0
Very important	2	4.3	10	21.3	35	74.4	47	100.0
Total	8	10.3	28	35.9	42	53.8	78	100.0

$X^2 = 20.534$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 70.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "processing of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	11	35.5	15	48.4	5	16.1	31	100.0
Very important	5	10.6	14	29.8	28	59.6	47	100.0
Total	16	20.5	29	37.2	33	42.3	78	100.0

$X^2 = 15.693$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 71.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	7	22.6	16	51.6	8	25.8	31	100.0
Very important	1	2.1	9	19.2	37	78.7	47	100.0
Total	8	10.3	25	32.0	45	57.7	78	100.0

$X^2 = 22.827$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 72.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	3	17.6	14	82.4	17	100.0
College	30	49.2	31	50.8	61	100.0
Total	33	42.3	45	57.7	78	100.0

$X^2 = 4.201$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 73.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	11	35.5	20	64.5	31	100.0
Very important	4	8.5	43	91.5	47	100.0
Total	15	19.2	63	80.8	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.099$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 74.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "farm business management"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	4	12.9	23	74.2	4	12.9	31	100.0
Very important	4	8.5	14	29.8	29	61.7	47	100.0
Total	8	10.3	37	47.4	33	42.3	78	100.0

$X^2 = 18.630$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 75.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "agricultural labor relations"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	7	22.6	8	25.8	12	38.7	4	12.9	31	100.0
Very important	2	4.3	8	17.0	15	31.9	22	46.8	47	100.0
Total	9	11.5	16	20.5	27	34.6	26	33.4	78	100.0

$X^2 = 12.830$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 76.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "public affairs education"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.3	14	45.2	11	35.5	31	100.0
Very important	2	4.3	17	36.2	28	59.5	47	100.0
Total	8	10.3	31	39.7	39	50.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.700$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 77.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Level of Education	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	0	0.0	14	20.6	54	79.4	68	100.0
College	10	12.2	28	34.1	44	53.7	82	100.0
Total	10	6.7	42	28.0	98	65.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 14.507$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 78.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "production of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	16.3	25	51.0	16	32.7	49	100.0
Very important	2	1.9	17	16.9	82	81.2	101	100.0
Total	10	6.7	42	28.0	98	65.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 35.855$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 79.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "processing of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	13	26.5	24	49.0	12	24.5	49	100.0
Very important	8	7.9	41	40.6	52	51.5	101	100.0
Total	21	14.0	65	43.3	64	42.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 14.332$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 80.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "processing of agricultural products"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	3	4.4	1	1.5	29	42.6	35	51.5	68	100.0
College	7	8.5	10	12.2	36	43.9	29	35.4	82	100.0
Total	10	6.7	11	7.3	65	43.3	64	42.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.052$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 81.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "processing of agricultural products"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	4	5.0	2	2.5	40	50.0	34	42.5	80	100.0
Town	6	8.6	9	12.9	25	35.7	30	42.8	70	100.0
Total	10	6.7	11	7.3	65	43.3	64	42.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 7.935$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 82.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Level of Education	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	2	2.9	14	20.6	52	76.5	68	100.0
College	10	12.2	27	32.9	45	54.9	82	100.0
Total	12	8.0	41	27.3	97	64.7	150	100.0

X^2 = 8.730   d.f. = 2   Significant at .02 level

TABLE 83.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	9	18.4	23	46.9	17	34.7	49	100.0
Very important	3	2.9	18	17.9	80	79.2	101	100.0
Total	12	8.0	41	27.3	97	64.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 30.120$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 84.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "marketing of agricultural products"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	24	46.2	28	53.8	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	13	23.6	42	76.4	55	100.0
Professional and other	16	37.2	27	62.8	43	100.0
Total	53	35.3	97	64.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.024$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 85.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	10	19.2	42	80.8	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	26	47.3	29	52.7	55	100.0
Professional and other	9	20.9	34	79.1	43	100.0
Total	45	30.0	105	70.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.370$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 86.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "farm business management"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	12.2	33	67.4	10	20.4	49	100.0
Very important	8	7.9	35	34.7	58	57.4	101	100.0
Total	14	9.4	68	45.3	68	45.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 18.413$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 87.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "farm business management"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	8	15.4	27	51.9	17	32.7	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	5	9.1	17	30.9	33	60.0	55	100.0
Professional and other	1	2.3	24	55.8	18	41.9	43	100.0
Total	14	9.4	68	45.3	68	45.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.928$ d.f. = 4 · Significant at .02 level

TABLE 88.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "farm business management"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	3	4.4	27	39.7	38	55.9	68	100.0
College	11	13.4	41	50.0	30	36.6	82	100.0
Total	14	9.4	68	45.3	68	45.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 7.151$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 89.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "agricultural labor relations"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	7	13.5	9	17.3	23	44.2	13	25.0	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	7	12.7	3	5.5	21	38.2	24	43.6	55	100.0
Professional and other	2	4.7	10	23.2	12	27.9	19	44.2	43	100.0
Total	16	10.7	22	14.7	56	37.3	56	37.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.593$ d.f. = 6 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 90.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "lawns, plants, and trees in the yard"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	14	17.5	14	17.5	46	57.5	6	7.5	80	100.0
Town	1	1.4	7	10.0	40	57.2	22	31.4	70	100.0
Total	15	10.0	21	14.0	86	57.3	28	18.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 22.595$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 91.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "agricultural labor relations"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	7	10.3	2	2.9	28	41.2	31	45.6	68	100.0
College	9	10.9	20	24.4	28	34.2	25	30.5	82	100.0
Total	16	10.7	22	14.7	56	37.3	56	37.3	150	100.0

X^2 = 14.439 d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 92.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance: Less Than Very Important N	%	Very Important N	%	Total N	%
High school or less	27	39.7	41	60.3	68	100.0
College	18	21.9	64	78.1	82	100.0
Total	45	30.0	105	70.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 4.767$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 93.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural subject "proper use and conservation of natural resources"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance: Less Than Very Important N	%	Very Important N	%	Total N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	33	41.3	47	58.7	80	100.0
Town	12	17.1	58	82.9	70	100.0
Total	45	30.0	105	70.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.216$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 94.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the home economics subject "leadership development"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	11	78.6	3	21.4	14	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	28	63.6	16	36.4	44	100.0
Professional and other	4	28.6	10	71.4	14	100.0
Total	43	59.7	29	40.3	72	100.0

X^2 = 7.996 d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 95.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the home economics subject "job preparation"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	37	58.7	26	41.3	63	100.0
Town	1	11.1	8	88.9	9	100.0
Total	38	52.8	34	47.2	72	100.0

X^2 = 5.382 d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 96.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the home economics subject "cultural arts"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	3	13.6	14	63.7	5	22.7	22	100.0
Over 45 years	13	26.0	12	24.0	25	50.0	50	100.0
Total	16	22.2	26	36.1	30	41.7	72	100.0

$X^2 = 10.425$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 97.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "leadership development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	25.8	17	54.8	6	19.4	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	16	34.0	28	59.6	47	100.0
Total	11	14.1	33	42.3	34	43.6	78	100.0

$X^2 = 13.839$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 98.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "job preparation"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.4	16	51.6	9	29.0	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	15	31.9	29	61.7	47	100.0
Total	9	11.5	31	39.8	38	48.7	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.640$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 99.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "clothing construction"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	28	43.1	28	43.1	9	13.8	65	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	14	29.2	28	58.3	6	12.5	48	100.0
Over 8 years	6	16.2	27	73.0	4	10.8	37	100.0
Total	48	32.0	83	55.3	19	12.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.590$ d.f. = 4   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 100.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "renovating furniture"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	14	26.9	23	44.2	15	28.9	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	11	20.0	11	20.0	33	60.0	55	100.0
Professional and other	10	23.3	15	34.9	18	41.8	43	100.0
Total	35	23.3	49	32.7	66	44.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.403$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 101.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "renovating furniture"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	17	21.3	19	23.7	44	55.0	80	100.0
Town	18	25.7	30	42.9	22	31.4	70	100.0
Total	35	23.3	49	32.7	66	44.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.206$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 102.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "leadership development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	16.3	27	55.1	14	28.6	49	100.0
Very important	5	5.0	47	46.5	49	48.5	101	100.0
Total	13	8.7	74	49.3	63	42.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 8.542$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 103.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from rural and urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the home economics subject "consumer education"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	5	15.6	16	50.0	11	34.4	32	100.0
Familiar	11	12.8	56	65.1	19	22.1	86	100.0
Very familiar	0	00.0	18	56.3	14	43.7	32	100.0
Total	16	10.7	90	60.0	44	29.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.580$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 104.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "consumer education"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	5	6.3	57	71.2	18	22.5	80	100.0
Town	11	15.7	33	47.1	26	37.2	70	100.0
Total	16	10.7	90	60.0	44	29.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.480$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 105.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "efficient use of food stamps"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	8	10.0	9	11.3	35	43.7	28	35.0	80	100.0
Town	10	14.3	20	28.6	18	25.7	22	31.4	70	100.0
Total	18	12.0	29	19.4	53	35.3	50	33.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.945$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 106.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "efficient use of food stamps"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	10	19.2	13	25.0	12	23.1	17	32.7	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	5	9.1	5	9.1	23	41.8	22	40.0	55	100.0
Professional and other	3	7.0	11	25.6	18	41.8	11	25.6	43	100.0
Total	18	12.0	29	19.4	53	35.3	50	33.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 13.173$ d.f. = 6 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 107.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "efficient use of food stamps"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	4	5.9	9	13.2	31	45.6	24	35.3	68	100.0
College	14	17.1	20	24.4	22	26.8	26	31.7	82	100.0
Total	18	12.0	29	19.4	53	35.3	50	33.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 10.118$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 108.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "community development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.4	19	61.2	6	19.4	31	100.0
Very important	1	2.1	24	51.1	22	46.8	47	100.0
Total	7	9.0	43	55.1	28	35.9	78	100.0

$X^2 = 10.453$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 109.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding and improving the environment"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	20	64.5	11	35.5	31	100.0
Very important	14	29.8	33	70.2	47	100.0
Total	34	43.6	44	56.4	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.804$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 110.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding public issues"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	21	67.7	10	32.3	31	100.0
Very important	18	38.3	29	61.7	47	100.0
Total	39	50.0	39	50.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 5.353$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 111.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "personal development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.4	16	51.6	9	29.0	31	100.0
Very important	2	4.3	17	36.2	28	59.6	47	100.0
Total	8	10.3	33	42.3	37	47.4	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.879$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 112.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "agricultural skills for boys"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	1	1.5	36	52.9	31	45.6	68	100.0
College	9	10.9	45	54.9	28	34.2	82	100.0
Total	10	6.7	81	54.0	59	39.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.301$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 113.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "agricultural skills for boys"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	2	2.5	39	48.8	39	48.7	80	100.0
Town	8	11.4	42	60.0	20	28.6	70	100.0
Total	10	6.7	81	54.0	59	39.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.204$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .02 level

TABLE 114.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "community development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	12.2	30	61.2	13	26.5	49	100.0
Very important	4	3.9	53	52.5	44	43.6	101	100.0
Total	10	6.7	83	55.3	57	38.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.372$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 115.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding public issues"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	12.3	25	51.0	18	36.7	49	100.0
Very important	4	4.0	38	37.6	59	58.4	101	100.0
Total	10	6.7	63	42.0	77	51.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 7.828$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 116.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "health education"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	12.2	26	53.1	17	34.7	49	100.0
Very important	2	2.0	39	38.6	60	59.4	101	100.0
Total	8	5.3	65	43.4	77	51.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.032$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 117.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding public issues"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	2	2.9	35	51.5	31	45.6	68	100.0
College	8	9.8	28	34.1	46	56.1	82	100.0
Total	10	6.7	63	42.0	77	51.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.046$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 118.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "personal development"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	9	18.4	25	51.0	15	30.6	49	100.0
Very important	4	3.9	43	42.6	54	53.5	101	100.0
Total	13	8.7	68	45.3	69	46.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.167$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 119.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "food-nutrition"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	1	1.5	34	50.0	33	48.5	68	100.0
College	11	13.4	37	45.1	34	41.5	82	100.0
Total	12	8.0	71	47.3	67	44.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 7.231$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 120.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "part-time farmers"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	14	27.5	37	72.5	51	100.0
College	12	57.1	9	42.9	21	100.0
Total	26	36.1	46	63.9	72	100.0

$X^2 = 4.470$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 121.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "migrant farm laborers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	44.4	10	55.6	18	100.0
Very important	40	74.1	14	25.9	54	100.0
Total	48	66.7	24	33.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 4.083$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 122.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "homeowners"

Age	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	9	40.9	12	54.6	1	4.5	22	100.0
Over 45 years	6	12.0	27	54.0	17	34.0	50	100.0
Total	15	20.8	39	54.2	18	25.0	72	100.0

$X^2 = 11.431$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 123.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "local (domestic) farm laborers"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Level of Education	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	8	15.7	31	60.8	12	23.5	51	100.0
College	13	61.9	5	23.8	3	14.3	21	100.0
Total	21	29.2	36	50.0	15	20.8	72	100.0

$X^2 = 15.572$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 124.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "migrant farm laborers"

Age	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	2	9.1	15	68.2	5	22.7	22	100.0
Over 45 years	15	30.0	16	32.0	19	38.0	50	100.0
Total	17	23.6	31	43.1	24	33.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 8.543$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 125.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "migrant farm laborers"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	15	29.4	17	33.3	19	37.3	51	100.0
College	2	9.5	14	66.7	5	23.8	21	100.0
Total	17	23.6	31	43.1	24	33.3	72	100.0

$X^2 = 7.137$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 126.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "large commercial farmers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	25.8	8	25.8	11	35.5	4	12.9	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	4	8.5	26	55.3	14	29.8	47	100.0
Total	11	14.1	12	15.4	37	47.4	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 12.486$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 127.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from urban counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the agricultural group "agricultural commodity organizations"

Involvement	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	20	86.9	3	13.1	23	100.0
Some	29	85.3	5	14.7	34	100.0
A lot	11	52.4	10	47.6	21	100.0
Total	60	76.9	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 9.772$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 128.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the agricultural group "small subsistence farmers"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	8	40.0	12	60.0	20	100.0
Familiar	31	77.5	9	22.5	40	100.0
Very familiar	10	55.6	8	44.4	18	100.0
Total	49	62.8	29	37.2	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.557$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 129.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "agribusiness firms".

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	10	32.3	4	12.9	15	48.4	2	6.4	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	9	19.1	27	57.5	8	17.0	47	100.0
Total	13	16.7	13	16.7	42	53.8	10	12.8	78	100.0

$X^2 = 9.853$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 130.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "agricultural commodity organizations"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	9	29.0	18	58.1	4	12.9	31	100.0
Very important	4	8.5	29	61.7	14	29.8	47	100.0
Total	13	16.7	47	60.2	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.068$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 131.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "homeowners"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	25.8	21	67.7	2	6.5	31	100.0
Very important	13	27.7	21	44.6	13	27.7	47	100.0
Total	21	26.9	42	53.9	15	19.2	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.238$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 132.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "local (domestic) farm laborers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	19.4	5	16.1	19	61.3	1	3.2	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	7	14.9	25	53.2	12	25.5	47	100.0
Total	9	11.5	12	15.4	44	56.4	13	16.7	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.536$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 133.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "migrant farm laborers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	8	25.8	8	25.8	12	38.7	3	9.7	31	100.0
Very important	3	6.4	10	21.3	21	44.6	13	27.7	47	100.0
Total	11	14.1	18	23.1	33	42.3	16	20.5	78	100.0

$X^2 = 8.265$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 134.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "large commercial farmers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	13	26.5	9	18.4	20	40.8	7	14.3	49	100.0
Very important	8	7.9	8	7.9	60	59.4	25	24.8	101	100.0
Total	21	14.0	17	11.4	80	53.3	32	21.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 15.171$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 135.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "large commercial farmers"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	7	13.5	8	15.4	32	61.5	5	9.6	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	8	14.5	3	5.5	32	58.2	12	21.8	55	100.0
Professional and other	6	14.0	6	14.0	16	37.2	15	34.8	43	100.0
Total	21	14.0	17	11.4	80	53.3	32	21.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.762$ d.f. = 6 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 136.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "average size family farmers"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	11	22.5	25	51.0	13	26.5	49	100.0
Very important	7	6.9	41	40.6	53	52.5	101	100.0
Total	18	12.0	66	44.0	66	44.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.484$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 137.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "average size family farmers"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	12	23.1	24	46.2	16	30.7	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	1	1.8	25	45.5	29	52.7	55	100.0
Professional and other	5	11.6	17	39.6	21	48.8	43	100.0
Total	18	12.0	66	44.0	66	44.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 13.599$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 138.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "small subsistence farmers"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	11	21.2	27	51.9	14	26.9	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	2	3.6	25	45.5	28	50.9	55	100.0
Professional and other	6	13.9	17	39.6	20	46.5	43	100.0
Total	19	12.7	69	46.0	62	41.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.457$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 139.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "hobby farmers"

	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant		Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	4	7.0	7	12.3	26	45.6	20	35.1	57	100.0
Over 45 years	12	12.9	29	31.2	29	31.2	23	24.7	93	100.0
Total	16	10.7	36	24.0	55	36.6	43	28.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.738$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 140.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "agricultural commodity organizations"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	7	14.3	7	14.3	24	48.9	11	22.5	49	100.0
Very important	3	3.0	9	8.9	60	59.4	29	28.7	101	100.0
Total	10	6.7	16	10.7	84	56.0	40	26.6	150	100.0

$X^2 = 8.356$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 141.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "agricultural commodity organizations"

Age	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	4	7.0	12	21.1	27	47.4	14	24.5	57	100.0
Over 45 years	6	6.5	4	4.3	57	61.3	26	27.9	93	100.0
Total	10	6.7	16	10.7	84	56.0	40	26.6	150	100.0

$X^2 = 10.690$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 142.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "homeowners"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	7	14.3	7	14.3	30	61.2	5	10.2	49	100.0
Very important	1	1.0	21	20.8	51	50.5	28	27.7	101	100.0
Total	8	5.3	28	18.7	81	54.0	33	22.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 16.990$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 143.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "homeowners"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	9	13.3	36	52.9	23	33.8	68	100.0
College	27	32.9	45	54.9	10	12.2	82	100.0
Total	36	24.0	81	54.0	33	22.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 13.936$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 144.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "agribusiness firms"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	13	26.5	6	12.3	25	51.0	5	10.2	49	100.0
Very important	5	5.0	18	17.8	60	59.4	18	17.8	101	100.0
Total	18	12.0	24	16.0	85	56.7	23	15.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 15.104$ d.f. = 3   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 145.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "local (domestic) farm laborers"

Age	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	2	3.5	16	28.1	32	56.1	7	12.3	57	100.0
Over 45 years	11	11.8	13	14.0	48	51.6	21	22.6	93	100.0
Total	13	8.7	29	19.3	80	53.3	28	18.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 8.596$ d.f. = 3   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 146.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "local (domestic) farm laborers"

	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	4	7.7	15	28.9	28	53.8	5	9.6	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	7	12.7	7	12.7	32	58.2	9	16.4	55	100.0
Professional and other	2	4.7	7	16.3	20	46.5	14	32.5	43	100.0
Total	13	8.7	29	19.3	80	53.3	28	18.7	150	100.0

X^2 = 13.290   d.f. = 6   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 147.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the agricultural group "local (domestic) farm laborers"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	5	7.4	5	7.4	41	60.2	17	25.0	68	100.0
College	8	9.8	24	29.3	39	47.5	11	13.4	82	100.0
Total	13	8.7	29	19.3	80	53.3	28	18.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 13.285$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 148.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "homemakers from minority groups"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	28	43.1	28	43.1	9	13.8	65	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	14	29.2	28	58.3	6	12.5	48	100.0
Over 8 years	6	16.2	27	73.0	4	10.8	37	100.0
Total	48	32.0	83	55.3	19	12.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.510$ d.f. = 4   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 149.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "farm homemakers"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	12	23.1	26	50.0	14	26.9	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	3	5.5	29	52.7	23	41.8	55	100.0
Professional and other	4	9.3	26	60.5	13	30.2	43	100.0
Total	19	12.7	81	54.0	50	33.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.548$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 150.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from rural and urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the home economics group "small town and village homemakers"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	15	46.9	12	37.5	5	15.6	32	100.0
Familiar	18	20.9	57	66.3	11	12.8	86	100.0
Very familiar	11	34.4	18	56.2	3	9.4	32	100.0
Total	44	29.3	87	58.0	19	12.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.552$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 151.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from rural and urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the home economics group "urban and city homemakers"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	6	18.8	12	37.5	14	43.7	32	100.0
Familiar	4	4.7	22	25.6	60	69.7	86	100.0
Very familiar	4	12.5	12	37.5	16	50.0	32	100.0
Total	14	9.3	46	30.7	90	60.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 10.413$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 152.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "middle income homemakers"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	11	16.2	45	66.2	12	17.6	68	100.0
College	30	36.6	42	51.2	10	12.2	82	100.0
Total	41	27.3	87	58.0	22	14.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 7.852$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 153.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "middle income homemakers"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	14	17.5	52	65.0	14	17.5	80	100.0
Town	27	38.6	35	50.0	8	11.4	70	100.0
Total	41	27.3	87	58.0	22	14.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 8.451$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 154.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "senior citizens"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	15	18.8	34	42.5	31	38.7	80	100.0
Town	16	22.9	40	57.1	14	20.0	70	100.0
Total	31	20.7	74	49.3	45	30.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.302$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 155.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "young married women"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	12	15.0	45	56.3	23	28.7	80	100.0
Town	21	30.0	38	54.3	11	15.7	70	100.0
Total	33	22.0	83	55.3	34	22.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.643$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 156.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "young married women"

Main Occupation	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	18	34.6	24	46.2	10	19.2	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	6	10.9	32	58.2	17	30.9	55	100.0
Professional and other	9	20.9	27	62.8	7	16.3	43	100.0
Total	33	22.0	83	55.3	34	22.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 10.857$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 157.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "homemakers from minority groups"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	5	10.2	6	12.2	29	59.2	9	18.4	49	100.0
Very important	2	2.0	24	23.8	50	49.5	25	24.7	101	100.0
Total	7	4.7	30	20.0	79	52.6	34	22.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 8.150$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 158.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "young married women"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	8	11.8	39	57.3	21	30.9	68	100.0
College	25	30.5	44	53.7	13	15.8	82	100.0
Total	33	22.0	83	55.3	34	22.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 9.719$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 159.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "urban and city youth"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	11	50.0	8	36.4	3	13.6	22	100.0
Over 45 years	9	18.0	29	58.0	12	24.0	50	100.0
Total	20	27.8	37	51.4	15	20.8	72	100.0

$X^2 = 7.811$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 160.--Association between the age of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from upper income families"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45 years and under	12	54.6	7	31.8	3	13.6	22	100.0
Over 45 years	8	16.0	29	58.0	13	26.0	50	100.0
Total	20	27.8	36	50.0	16	22.2	72	100.0

$X^2 = 11.317$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 161.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from urban counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "farm youth"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Involvement	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	13	56.5	10	43.5	23	100.0
Some	25	73.5	9	26.5	34	100.0
A lot	8	38.1	13	61.9	21	100.0
Total	46	59.0	32	41.0	78	100.0

X^2 = 6.818 d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 162.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from urban counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "all youth between 9 and 19 years of age"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Involvement	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	18	78.3	5	21.7	23	100.0
Some	19	55.9	15	44.1	34	100.0
A lot	8	38.1	13	61.9	21	100.0
Total	45	57.7	33	42.3	78	100.0

X^2 = 7.336 d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 163.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from urban counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "rural non-farm youth"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Involvement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	9	39.1	11	47.8	3	13.1	23	100.0
Some	9	26.5	20	58.8	5	14.7	34	100.0
A lot	3	14.3	8	38.1	10	47.6	21	100.0
Total	21	26.9	39	50.0	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 11.185$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 164.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "rural non-farm youth"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	10	50.0	8	40.0	2	10.0	20	100.0
Familiar	8	20.0	23	57.5	9	22.5	40	100.0
Very familiar	3	16.7	8	44.4	7	38.9	18	100.0
Total	21	26.9	39	50.0	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 9.770$ d.f. = 4   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 165.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "all youth between 7 and 19 years of age"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	5	16.1	20	64.5	6	19.4	31	100.0
Very important	5	10.7	19	40.4	23	48.9	47	100.0
Total	10	12.8	39	50.0	29	37.2	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.004$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 166.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from urban counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "all youth between 7 and 19 years of age"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Involvement	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	19	82.6	4	17.4	23	100.0
Some	21	61.8	13	38.2	34	100.0
A lot	9	42.9	12	57.1	21	100.0
Total	49	62.8	29	37.2	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.455$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 167.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "small town and village youth"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	9	45.0	11	55.0	20	100.0
Familiar	7	17.5	33	82.5	40	100.0
Very familiar	3	16.7	15	83.3	18	100.0
Total	19	24.4	59	75.6	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.224$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 168.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from low income families"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	11	21.1	29	55.8	12	23.1	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	1	1.8	32	58.2	22	40.0	55	100.0
Professional and other	5	11.6	23	53.5	15	34.9	43	100.0
Total	17	11.3	84	56.0	49	32.7	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.352$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 169.--Association between the residential background of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from middle income families"

Residential Background	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Farm and rural non-farm	3	3.7	3	3.7	53	66.3	21	26.3	80	100.0
Town	6	8.6	13	18.6	36	51.4	15	21.4	70	100.0
Total	9	6.0	16	10.7	89	59.3	36	24.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 10.879$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 170.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from middle income families"

	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman, non-agricultural	13	25.0	30	57.7	9	17.3	52	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	2	3.6	37	67.3	16	29.1	55	100.0
Professional and other	10	23.2	22	51.2	11	25.6	43	100.0
Total	25	16.7	89	59.3	36	24.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.591$ d.f. = 4 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 171.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from middle income families"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	1	1.5	1	1.5	47	69.1	19	27.9	68	100.0
College	8	9.8	15	18.3	42	51.2	17	20.7	82	100.0
Total	9	6.0	16	10.7	89	59.3	36	24.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 16.927$ d.f. = 3   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 172.--Association between the level of education of the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "youth from upper income families"

Level of Education	Perception of Relative Importance									
	Unimportant And Not Very Important		Neutral		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school or less	4	5.9	12	17.6	38	55.9	14	20.6	68	100.0
College	17	20.7	24	29.3	31	37.8	10	12.2	82	100.0
Total	21	14.0	36	24.0	69	46.0	24	16.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 12.224$ d.f. = 3 Significant at .01 level

TABLE 173.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from rural and urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "all youth between 9 and 19 years of age"

Economic Value of Agriculture to County	Perception of Relative Importance							
	Neutral And Less		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	6	12.2	28	57.2	15	30.6	49	100.0
Very important	3	2.9	54	53.5	44	43.6	101	100.0
Total	9	6.0	82	54.7	59	38.3	150	100.0

$X^2 = 6.219$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 174.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the home economics subject "clothing construction"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	20	48.8	21	51.2	41	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	10	47.6	11	52.4	21	100.0
Over 8 years	2	12.5	14	87.5	16	100.0
Total	32	41.0	46	59.0	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.778$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 175.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) group "all youth between 9 and 19 years of age"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	16	80.0	4	20.0	20	100.0
Familiar	22	55.0	18	45.0	40	100.0
Very familiar	7	38.9	11	61.1	18	100.0
Total	45	57.7	33	42.3	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.804$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 176.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the home economics group "urban and city homemakers"

Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	12	60.0	8	40.0	20	100.0
Familiar	12	30.0	28	70.0	40	100.0
Very familiar	10	55.6	8	44.4	18	100.0
Total	34	43.6	44	56.4	78	100.0

$X^2 = 6.243$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 177.--Association between the tenure of the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the home economics group "low income homemakers"

Tenure	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 4 years	30	73.2	11	26.8	41	100.0
Between 4 and 8 years	18	85.7	3	14.3	21	100.0
Over 8 years	7	43.8	9	56.2	16	100.0
Total	55	70.5	23	29.5	78	100.0

$X^2 = 7.985$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .02 level

TABLE 178.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "understanding economics and the American business system"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman non-agricultural	11	78.6	3	21.4	14	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	27	61.4	17	38.6	44	100.0
Professional and other	4	28.6	10	71.4	14	100.0
Total	42	58.3	30	41.7	72	100.0

$X^2 = 7.627$ d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 179.--Association between the economic value of agriculture to the county as perceived by the commissioners from urban counties and their perception of the 4-H (youth work) subject "health education"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
Economic Value of Agriculture to County	N	%	N	%	N	%
Of little importance to important	19	61.3	12	38.7	31	100.0
Very important	16	34.0	31	66.0	47	100.0
Total	35	44.9	43	55.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 4.559$ d.f. = 1 Significant at .05 level

TABLE 180.--Association between the main occupation of the commissioners from rural counties and their perception of the agricultural group "part-time farmers"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
Main Occupation	N	%	N	%	N	%
Businessman non-agricultural	6	42.9	8	57.1	14	100.0
Farmer, businessman agricultural related	11	25.0	33	75.0	44	100.0
Professional and other	9	64.3	5	35.7	14	100.0
Total	26	36.1	46	63.9	72	100.0

$X^2 = 7.448$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .05 level

TABLE 181.--Association between the familiarity of the commissioners from urban counties with the Cooperative Extension Service and their perception of the agricultural group "agricultural commodity organizations"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
Familiarity With Cooperative Extension Service	Less Than Very Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not very familiar	17	85.0	3	15.0	20	100.0
Familiar	34	85.0	6	15.0	40	100.0
Very familiar	9	50.0	9	50.0	18	100.0
Total	60	76.9	18	23.1	78	100.0

$X^2 = 9.555$ d.f. = 2   Significant at .01 level

TABLE 182.--Association between the involvement of commissioners from rural counties in Cooperative Extension Service programs and/or activities and their perception of the home economics group "upper income homemakers"

	Perception of Relative Importance					
	Neutral And Less		Important And Very Important		Total	
Involvement	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	5	45.5	6	54.5	11	100.0
Some	16	33.3	32	66.7	48	100.0
A lot	11	84.6	2	15.4	13	100.0
Total	32	44.4	40	55.6	72	100.0

X^2 = 10.901 d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allport, Floyd H. Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955.

Bartley, Howard S. Principles of Perception. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Beardslee, David C., and Wertheimer, M., eds. Readings in Perception. Princton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958.

Bonner, Hubert. Social Psychology an Interdisciplinary Approach. New York: American Book Company, 1953.

Boring, E. G., Langfeld, H. S., and Weld, H. P., eds. Foundations of Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1948.

Dember, W. M. The Psychology of Perception. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.

Gault, R. H., and Delton, H. T. Outline of General Psychology. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1925.

Hartley, E. L. Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Hilgard, Ernest R. Introduction to Psychology. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.

Hobhouse, L. T. Development and Purpose. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1969.

Ittelson, William H., and Cantril, Hadley. Perception: A Transactional Approach. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1954.

James, William. Principles of Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1890.

Johnson, D. M. Essentials of Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Kahn, Robert L., and Cannell, Charles F. The Dynamics of Interviewing: Theory, Technique and Cases. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

Klausmier, Herbert J. Learning and Human Abilities: Education Psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

Krech, David, and Crutchfield, Richard S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Krech, David, Crutchfield, Richard S., and Ballachey, Egerton L. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Munn, Norman L. Introduction to Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.

Newcomb, Theodore M., Turner, Ralph H., and Converse Philip E. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Queener, E. L. Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1957.

Sargent, S. Stansfeld, and Williamson, Robert C. Social Psychology. 3rd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966.

Sherif, Mauzafer, and Sherif, Carolyn W. An Outline of Social Psychology. Rev. ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Smith, K. U., and Smith, W. M. The Behavior of Man, An Introduction to Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

Solley, Charles M., and Murphy, Gardner. Development of the Perceptual World. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

Stagner, R., and Karwoski, T. Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 5th ed. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1947.

Articles and Periodicals

Beach, Frank A. "Body Chemistry and Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 56-94.

Bell, W. V. "Finance, Legislation and Public Policy for Adult Education." Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960, pp. 138-155.

Bishop, C. E. "Urbanization of Rural America Alters Extension Responsibilities." Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 7 (Fall, 1969), pp. 145-152.

Blake, Robert R., Ramsey, Glenn V., and Moran, Louis J. "Perceptual Processes as Basic to an Understanding of Complex Behavior." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 3-24.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Toward an Integrated Theory of Personality." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 206-257.

Bruner, Jerome S. "The Role of Learning in Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 121-147.

Bruner, Jerome S. "Social Psychology and Perception." in Readings in Social Psychology. Edited by E. Maccoby, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley. 3rd ed. New York: 1958, pp. 85-94.

Cantril, H. "Perception and Interpersonal Relations." American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 114, 1957, pp. 119-126.

Cantril, H. "Perception and Interpersonal Relations." Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. Edited by E. P. Hollander and R. G. Hunt. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 284-291.

Dennis, Wayne. "Cultural and Developmental Factors in Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 148-169.

Hilgard, Ernest R. "The Role of Learning in Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 95-120.

Ittelson, William H. "Perception and Transactional Psychology." Psychology: A Study of Science. Vol. 4. Edited by Sigmund Koch. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962, pp. 660-704.

Johnson, D. M. "A Systematic Treatment of Judgment." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 42, 1945, pp. 193-224.

Klein, G. S. "The Personal World Through Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 328-355.

Knowles, Malcolm S. "Historical Development of the Adult Education Movement in the United States." Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960, pp. 7-28.

Matthews, J. L. "The Cooperative Extension Service." Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960, pp. 218-229.

Miller, Vernon. "The Future of Extension--Rural or Urban." The Progressive Farmer, Vol. 87, No. 9, 1972, p. 90.

Morgan, Clifford T. "Some Structural Factors in Perception." Perception, An Approach to Personality. Edited by R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951, pp. 25-55.

Postman, L., Bruner, J. S., and McGinnies, E. "Personal Values as Selective Factors in Perception." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, Vol. 12, 1948, pp. 142-154.

Shannon, T. J., and Schoenfeld, C. A. "Whither Goest the Cooperative Extension Service?" Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 3 (Winter, 1965), pp. 200-204.

Zalkind, S. S., and Costello, T. W. "Perception: Implications for Administration." Readings in Managerial Psychology. Edited by H. J. Leavitt and L. R. Pondy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 32-47.

Other Materials

A People and a Spirit, A Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee. Fort Collins, Colorado: Printing and Publications Service, Colorado State University, November, 1968.

A People and a Spirit, A Condensation of the Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee. Fort Collins, Colorado: Printing and Publications Service, Colorado State University, November, 1968

Amburgey, L. R. "Commercial Fertilizer Manufacturer and Distributor Representatives' Perception of the Arizona Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Biever, L. J. "Roles of the County Extension Agents as Perceived by County Agricultural Committee Members in Wisconsin." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957.

Blalock, T. C. "State Legislators' Perception of the North Carolina Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Campbell, Charles Eugene. "Oklahoma's County Commissioners' Attitudes Toward the Use of Area Specialized Agricultural Extension Agents." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968.

Cavender, A. R. "Meat Packers' and Processors' Perception of the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1964.

Dowell, G. L. "A Study of County Commissioners' Cognition and Appraisal of the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969.

Four-H in the Seventies, A Statement Developed by the 1970 and 1971 Extension Committee on Organization and Policy 4-H - Youth Subcommittees of the NASULGC. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, April, 1971.

Griffith, P. W. "Formula Feed Operators' Perception of the Kansas Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Horne, R. H. "County Commissioner's and County Agent's Perception of the Utah State University's Extension Services." Unpublished Master's thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1966.

Lawson, W. M. "Commercial Cotton Farm Operators' Perception of the California Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1959.

McCown, J. T. "The Florida Legislators' Perception of the Florida Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1969.

Moore, P. J. "Montana County Extension Program Planning Committee Members' Perception of the Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Policies and Procedures Manual, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. Gainesville, Florida: Editorial Department, University of Florida, June, 1971.

Smith, G. W. "An Exploration of Factors Associated With North Carolina Legislators' Perception of the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1967.

Straughn, A. A. "A Study of the Perceived Role of County Extension Agents in Program Planning in Florida and Kansas." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Sub-Committee on Scope and Responsibility, Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities. The Cooperative Extension Service Today - A Statement on Scope and Responsibility. Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, 1958.

Torrance, L. T. "County Commissioner Chairmens' Perception of the Home Economics Phase of the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service Program." Unpublished Ed.D dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970.

United States Bureau of the Census. Census of Agriculture-Florida. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1969.

United States Bureau of the Census. General Population Characteristics-Florida. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1971.

White, E. E. "A Study of County Commissioners' Perception of the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, Northeastern Extension District, North Carolina." Unpublished Master's thesis, North Carolina State University, 1965.

White, L. E. "A Study of Alabama Legislators' Perception of the Auburn University Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1970.

VITA

Earl McNeil Kelly was born in Parrish, Florida in January, 1926. He graduated from Palmetto (Florida) High School in June, 1943 and enrolled for one summer term at the University of Florida. He entered the United States Army Air Corps in February, 1944 and was released in November, 1945 upon termination of World War II. He entered the University of Florida in September, 1946 and received a Bachelor of Science Degree in agriculture in June, 1949. He served as Assistant Animal Husbandman at the Range Cattle Experiment Station, Ona, Florida for seven months before assuming the position of Assistant County Extension Agent in Bushnell (Sumter County) Florida. After serving fourteen months in this position he was promoted to the position of Assistant County Extension Agent in Bartow (Polk County) Florida where he served for two years. He transferred to Palmetto (Manatee County) Florida in 1953 where he served as Assistant and Associate County Extension Agent until 1966. He received the Master of Agriculture Degree from the University of Florida while Associate County Agent in Manatee County. He served as County Agent and County Extension Chairman in Tavares (Lake County) Florida from May, 1966 until March, 1969 at which time he was promoted to the position of District Extension Agent at the University of Florida. He received a faculty development grant and leave in 1969 to attend Florida State University to study toward a doctorate in Adult Education. Upon completion of residence work at Florida State University he returned to his present position of District Extension Agent for Central Florida.

He is married to the former Annie Ruth Pigott. They have three children, Deborah Ann, Donald McNeil, and Robert Earl.

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG1 1973
on Adult Education